THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX APRIL, 1956 No. 430

Editorial

WE are very glad to be able to publish Dr Haigh's article on "The New Lectionary", and we are confident that our readers will share our gratitude to him for the vast amount of close and detailed work he has expended upon it. There is nothing we wish to add directly on the subject, but we will take the opportunity of asking whether the time has not come when permission and indeed encouragement should be given for the lessons in church to be read from the Revised Standard Version for an experimental period. At present the only officially permitted alternative to the Authorized Version is the Revised Version. So far as we can see, there is now nothing whatever to be said for the R.V. (except that it includes the Apocrypha). The R.S.V. is to be preferred to it on all grounds: it is based on much more recent scholarship, it is a more accurate rendering of the original text, and its English is much more euphonious and worthy of the A.V. than is that of the R.V. The R.S.V. is not, of course, a "modern translation" of the Bible like Moffatt's or Knox's or the new English translation which a company of British divines is at present engaged in producing. The R.S.V. is a revision of the A.V., and the best one we are likely to have for a long time to come. In addition to its other merits, it is evidently "popular" (which the R.V. has never been) since it has already sold over three and a half million copies. Many of us have been using it in private for a number of years, and cannot understand why the Church of England is the only church in England which does not allow the Bible to be read in church in any version later than that of 1881. And there is a further consideration. It is presumably hoped that, when the new English translation is at length ready for publication, it will be deemed suitable for reading in church. But this will mark so far-reaching a break with the familiar A.V. that, whatever its virtues, it is likely to encounter a good deal of conservative prejudice. On this ground as well, it is desirable that congregations shall now become accustomed to hearing alongside the A.V. a more modern version and one that has more to commend it than the R.V.

* * * * *

We were able to hear only part of the debate in the Church Assembly in February on the reform of the ecclesiastical courts. We found ourselves in agreement with the speaker who pointed out that, if in the 19th century those who wanted a rigid system of church law administered by completely efficient church courts had had what they wanted, the results for the life of the church would have been deplor-

able. He therefore urged the Assembly to be on its guard against fastening on the church now a reform both of canon law and of ecclesiastical courts, determined by contemporary conditions, which would make the church system so inflexible that the healthy processes of growth were prevented. If that happened, by the end of the century the reforms would be seen to have been disastrous. No doubt, from time to time both church law and church courts need to be reformed, but the two reforms should not be synchronized if a wholesome flexibility is to be preserved. If you have an up-to-date system of church law, then it is desirable that the courts should be somewhat cumbersome or ineffective so that the law cannot be easily or rigidly enforced; if you have a stream-lined system of church courts, then it is desirable that the law they are supposed to administer should be more or less obsolete. This suggestion can hardly be expected to be pleasing to lawyers, for whom we have a great respect, or to legalists, who are a menace anyhow, but it may not be displeasing to the Holy Ghost.

* * * * *

The Church Assembly hardly covered itself with glory in its rejection of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a final court of appeal on questions of law only. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury, in an otherwise excellent speech, allowed himself a reference to this Committee as having a "desperate record". We doubt whether an impartial historical survey would substantiate this aspersion. The 1952 Moberly Church and State Report remarked, with equal truth and candour, that "it may be questioned whether the authority of the Judicial Committee is assailed on genuine grounds of principle or whether the objection is only made *ex post facto*, because the Committee's judgments have been found distasteful by a powerful party in the Church. . . . But to any allegation of partisanship it must in fairness be replied that the Committee's decisions have by no means been all of the same ecclesiastical colour. In the cases of Archdeacon Denison (1858) and of Bennett of Frome (1872) the Committee upheld the Court of Arches in sanctioning a view of the Real Presence more advanced than was customary at the time. In *Westerton* v. *Liddell* (1857), the Committee actually allowed a more liberal use of ornaments than had the diocesan and provincial courts. Again in the Ridsdale case (1877) it modified the judgment of the Court of Arches in a direction less unfavourable to the Eastward position and the use of wafer bread." Where lies the "desperate record" in all this? Moreover, the late C. P. S. Clarke's *The Oxford Movement and After* stated that, so long as the Committee's decisions favoured the Tractarian party, no whisper of criticism of its secular character was heard! "This is not surprising. It is human nature not to look gift horses in the mouth, and when decisions are favourable one does not question the court." It was only when "the law could be invoked against the 'Ritualist' " that "the law itself was challenged, the court which interpreted the law repudiated"; and, as the author candidly further admitted, "even if the authority of the court had been unim-

peachable, its judgments in the Purchas and Ridsdale cases would have been disputed"! It should be remembered also, as the Primate forcefully but vainly urged, that the partnership of church and state cannot be continued if one partner repudiates all authority of the other; and, after all, the Judicial Committee is part of the Queen in Council and for the abolition of its powers in ecclesiastical causes the assent of the Crown in Parliament is essential. It is much to be hoped that reflection will induce wiser second thoughts.

* * * * *

We hope all French-speaking readers of THEOLOGY will take note of that fact that *Bulletin Œcuménique Anglican* has lately appeared in a brighter dress. This periodical serves the useful purpose of interpreting the Church of England to its interested friends on the continent, especially in France, Belgium and Switzerland. A recent issue, for example, contained articles by the Bishops of Chichester and Exeter, Canon Eric Kemp and the Principal of Wycliffe Hall on the Convocations decisions with regard to the Church of South India. The annual subscription in England is 7s. 6d. per annum (S.P.C.K., 322 Regent Street, London, W.1).

The New Lectionary[1]

I. INTRODUCTION

THE speed with which the Bishop of Chelmsford and his colleagues on the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York drafted the *New Lectionary*, and had it printed and published within two years, was as commendable as it was surprising, especially if regard were had to all their other commitments and to the fact that their lectionary is for ordinary week-days throughout the year as well as for Sundays and Holy Days. The speed with which the Convocations, apparently without taking any time to inspect and consider it, accepted this lectionary last October and resolved that, on and after Advent Sunday next, it should be the only lectionary authorized for use in the Church of England was, and remains, astonishing.

It would be presumptuous to think that this seemingly excessive haste on the part of the Convocations was due to mere irresponsibility, to weariness of a complex subject discussed on many previous occasions, or to failure to recognize the claim of their Committees' labours upon their full attention. Nor is it easy to think that it was simply an act of blind, even though merited, trust in their Committees' judgment. More probably, and intelligibly, this speed in acceptance was due to a feeling that the efforts of many years must not be allowed to end in futility, that the hour had come in which to bring to an end the continued use within the Church of England

[1] The Table of Lessons revised by order of the Convocations of Canterbury and York and authorized, etc., October 1955. Church Information Board. 1s. 6d.

of different lectionaries, increasing as they do the kind of disorder which revision of the lectionary had been designed in part to reduce, and that it would be best from now on, and even at some risk, to have only one lectionary in use to which all further amendments proposed must be addressed.

However that may be, there has now been time in which to examine this *New Lectionary* closely and, happily enough, it would appear that the Convocations have been fortunate and that this lectionary is on the whole an admirable production, certainly better in most ways than any of the other lectionaries in use and not unworthy to be made alone authoritative, even though it raises and leaves unresolved in the mind several issues of some importance and, in various detailed ways, seems to need and deserve some further consideration and amendment, for which, it is understood, opportunity will be given.

The comments upon this *New Lectionary* which follow are made with the utmost submission and respect, even though they may not always read as if they were, and in the hope that they may commend the opinions about it thus summarily expressed, and may assist some, who have not the time nor perhaps the inclination to examine this lectionary, to feel that they have been given some further information about its contents; and the fact that these comments are made by one who was in some measure responsible for the compilation of the *Amended Lectionary*, now to be superseded, may give them an interest for some readers of THEOLOGY which otherwise they would not have.

Unfortunately some abbreviations must be used. Books of the Bible, Sundays and Holy Days will be referred to in the shortest possible way (Acts, 5 Lent, St John Baptist) and Morning Prayer as M.P., etc.; 1871 will signify the *Table of Lessons, 1871*, now rarely followed, which appointed Proper, i.e. special, first lessons for all Sundays in the ecclesiastical year and Proper second lessons for very few, and Proper first and second lessons for Holy Days. R.L. will mean the so-called *Revised Lectionary* of 1922 (1928) which is the lectionary still used in probably most parish churches in England. A.L. will mean the *Amended Lectionary* which, first published in 1944, was designed to improve on R.L.'s selection of lessons for Sundays and Holy Days; and N.L. will mean this *New Lectionary*, the latest attempt to improve on R.L. and so incidentally on A.L.

It must also be made clear from the start that these comments are limited to that part of N.L. which appoints lessons for Sundays and Holy Days and Special Occasions, and that references to R.L., made in the course of these comments, are references to the corresponding part of it, as distinct from its provision of lessons for week-days. Detailed examination of even this much of a lectionary and comparison of it with corresponding parts of other lectionaries are sufficiently exacting. Further, it will be conceded that special importance attaches to the selection of lessons for Sundays as distinct from other days, if only because of the much larger number of people who may hear them read.

May hear them read? Yes, indeed. The more time and energy which the present writer has given to the subject of lectionaries, the more acutely conscious he has become of the still largely unrealized, and even often unrecognized, evangelical possibilities attaching to the reading of Holy Scripture in the course of public worship. He can never forget a remark made to him early in his ministry by a woman whose whole way of life appeared to have been changed through attendance at a single evening service. "It wasn't through the sermon the Vicar preached that God got me: it was through one of those sermons the other man read." No lectionary, however good, will of itself suffice to ensure that more of these possibilities are actualized in our midst: so much will always depend also upon the insight, sympathy and audibility with which lessons are read and upon the attention and expectancy with which they are heard.

II. General Considerations

N.L. is admirably set up and printed: and it has a valuable Introduction explaining why the lessons which it appoints are arranged as they are and that, like those in A.L., they form a two-year course. Herein N.L., like A.L., has the advantage over R.L., in that the latter, though appointing two first and two second lessons for most Sunday mornings and often three for Sunday evenings, does not secure that these alternative lessons should be read as successive courses, one one year and one the next.

N.L. also provides, as R.L. does (though somewhat confusedly, and as A.L. promised to do but never got as far as doing), alternative lessons from the Old Testament for those few parish priests and others who apparently still feel scruples about reading or hearing lessons read in church from the Apocryphal writings. Rather oddly, though doubtless for some good reason, this regard for tender consciences need not, it seems, be displayed on Holy Days, for which no such alternative lessons are supplied. With this single exception, however, N.L. eschews all alternative lessons. This alone will go far to commend it widely. Reference has been made to the number of choices presented by R.L., even if used as a two-year course: and A.L. offers about eighty alternatives in two years. This has certainly been unpopular with many of the clergy and Readers. It is argued that such choices make a needless break in the unity of the Church's worship, that normally preachers and others should be able to know beforehand what lessons will be read at a service and that, while there may be reasons for the choices offered, they are often neither obvious nor ascertainable. But, while this self-denying ordinance on the part of N.L.'s compilers may be welcomed by many, it should be recognized that if, as at present, it is to allow of no exceptions, some well-known passages of the Bible may in future be rarely, if ever, read in church on Sundays; and one occasion at least on which, for a merely practical reason, an alternative lesson (? Luke 19. 29–end) ought to be inserted is Palm Sunday, M.P., because Matthew 26, a chapter of seventy-five verses, which N.L. properly appoints, is in

a number of churches read as the Gospel in the Eucharist on that morning, in accordance with the 1928 Prayer Book.

The most obvious quality of N.L., however, is its *orderliness*, the fact that in it, on Sundays as on week-days, the lessons are for the most part arranged in sets or blocks, passages being appointed for successive Sundays from a Book of the Bible in the order in which they occur in it, and to a large extent from Books of the Bible in the order in which those books occur therein. N.L. appears to "jump about" less than A.L.

Now it is clear enough that such orderliness (or consecutiveness) is convenient and desirable in a lectionary for week-days: but why much, if any, value should be attached to it in the case of Proper, or special, lessons appointed for Sundays, it is difficult to see. Indeed it is hard to believe that any of the laity would object, or even notice, if the second lesson at M.P. on one Sunday after Trinity was from Matthew and that on the next Sunday from Romans; and two points which arise here deserve careful consideration.

(i) This kind of orderliness, save within strict limits, is inconsistent with the appointment of first and second lessons linked with one another, whether somewhat superficially but informingly, as e.g. Queen of Sheba and our Lord's reference to the queen of the south, or more profoundly, e.g. Isa. 28. 9–22 and 1 Pet. 2. 1–10—*I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone*, etc.

These interconnexions between O.T. and N.T. undoubtedly arrest the attention of congregations. Such linked lessons also offer opportunities for much needed teaching; and it will be generally admitted how much Biblical scholarship has done in recent years to focus attention on these interconnexions and on the way in which they sometimes seem to point forward, beyond the Bible, to the faith, life, vocation and destiny of the Church. Indeed, some appreciation of this "mystery of the Bible" is of the utmost importance for the strengthening of faith in God and in his providence and transcendent purposes in Christ. The compilers of N.L. fully recognize this and say so in their Preface (p. 2). Indeed, they even asked one of their number (Dr Morgan, Bishop of Truro) to draft a lectionary of linked lessons for all the Sundays after Trinity, designed to illustrate these interconnexions: but, after consideration of the draft, they felt unable to embody it.

Now it is not suggested that they were mistaken in that decision. It is possible to have too much of any good thing. "Typology" can become a craze. Interconnexions between O.T. and N.T. can be detected where they do not exist; and a long series of lessons designed to illustrate them might well become rather wearisome. On the other hand, can it be felt to be satisfactory that N.L. contains fewer and not more linked lessons than A.L., or even R.L., and reflects so little of that kind of recent Biblical scholarship to which reference has been made? Is there not something at stake here more important than an appearance of orderliness in arrangement? It is this unresolved issue, of which nobody would expect the compilers of N.L. to be able now to take a radically different view, that may justify

doubt whether even N.L., with all its merits, will altogether satisfy the Church.

"Deep calls unto deep." Some ears at least will always hear some N.L. first lessons calling in vain for their true counterparts from the New Testament in place of the second lesson with which N.L. yokes them, e.g. on 19 Trinity (though better Septuagesima?) Prov. 8—*The master workman in creation*—calling for Col. 1—*The first-born of all creation.* N.L.'s lessons for Sexagesima in Year II seem strangely less appropriate than those in Year I, but both the transfer of *The Flood,* Gen. 6. 5–end, from Sexagesima (1871, R.L. and A.L.) to Quinquagesima and the severing of its link with Luke 17. 20–end (R.L. and A.L.)—*In the days of Noah*—appear unnecessary.

(ii) Orderliness in a Sunday lectionary for the Church of England does not raise only the question just now discussed. If carried beyond a certain point it tends, even though almost superhuman ingenuity is exerted, to cause the congregation at M.P. to hear much more of some parts of the Bible than the congregation at E.P., and vice versa, and even to deprive one or other congregation of the opportunity to hear read in church some of the best loved passages in the Bible.

The authors of N.L. recognize that nowadays "morning and evening congregations are mainly composed of different persons"; and have been most successful in their distribution of lessons, from Exodus, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the first three Gospels and Acts; but even they do not escape some of the unfortunate effects of their "tidiness". Under N.L. as it is, a Sunday morning congregation will never hear a lesson from the Book of Daniel and hear only six to *eight* lessons from St John in each two years (one, and five to seven), while an evening congregation will hear twenty-one to *twenty-three* (four, and seventeen to nineteen). On the other hand, a Sunday evening congregation will hear only one lesson from Ephesians in two years and never hear read in church Isa. 35—*The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad*—(though, as it happens, this could easily be read in Year II on 4 Advent?) nor Rom. 12—*I beseech you therefore, brethren*—nor even the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15. 11–end). R.L. and A.L., with all their faults, do a little better than that; and, despite the technical and other difficulties in making any changes in a lectionary without upsetting most, if not all, of it and even at the cost of sacrificing a little orderliness or even allowing an alternative lesson here and there, some slightly more generous distribution of such passages as those mentioned might be attempted?

We pass now to consider the lessons selected by N.L. as distinct from the way in which they are arranged.

III. Sundays: Lessons from O.T. and Apocrypha

Examination of the Sunday lessons appointed by N.L. from the O.T. and Apocryphal writings shows that, ignoring minor differences of verse beginnings and endings, nearly two-thirds of them are substantially lessons which R.L. and A.L. also appoint. This fact alone

should inspire confidence. In regard to the remaining third, about seventy lessons, the compilers of N.L., who acknowledge their debt to a Scottish lectionary, show a healthy independence of mind, accepting more than twenty of A.L.'s new insertions, but re-inserting nearly as many R.L. lessons excluded by A.L., and making some thirty new insertions of their own.

Most of N.L.'s re-insertions from R.L. seem well justified, e.g. Exod. 4. 27–6. 1—*No straw for bricks*—and 35. 30–36. 7—*Bezalel the cunning workman*; Deut. 4. 25–40—*Ask of the days that are past*, etc.; and many of N.L.'s new insertions will be generally welcomed, e.g. Gen. 25. 1–28 and 24. 29–61—*Rebekah at the well*; 1 Sam. 9. 1–10. 1—*Call of Saul*; 2 Sam. 11—*Uriah's wife*; Isa. 66. 10–18—*As one whom his mother comforteth*; Jer. 11. 1–14—*Pray not for this people*; Joel 2. 1–11—*Day of the Lord great and terrible*—and, from the Apocrypha, Ecclus. 42, 15–end and 43. 13–26—*The works of the Lord*.

Some of N.L.'s insertions, however, need to be weighed against some of the lessons in R.L. and A.L. omitted by N.L., i.e. omitted altogether from use on Sunday or Holy Day, or left to be read on a Holy Day only, having been hitherto read on a Sunday also. Subjected to this test some of N.L.'s new insertions may well seem questionable. Among omissions of the first kind are Exod. 20, 1–17 (A.L.) —*The Ten Commandments* (which it might be thought desirable to have read *from the Bible* at least once in two years?); 1 Sam. 26. 5–end (R.L. and A.L.)—*David's chivalry to Saul* (all the more desirable in view of N.L.'s insertion of 1 Sam. 18. 1–16—*Saul's jealousy of David*?) and Wisdom 13. 1–9 (A.L.)—*The author of Beauty*. Similarly, is it worth making one R.L. lesson from Ezra into two, if it means one fewer from Nehemiah, e.g. 6. 1–16—*I am doing a great work, so I cannot come down* (A.L. alt.)? Among the lessons omitted in the other sense are Isa. 49. 1–12—*Listen, O isles*; 50. 4–10—*He that walketh in darkness*, and 60—*Arise, shine for thy light is come* (which N.L. would begin at v. 9 ?); Wisdom 3. 1–9—*The souls of the righteous*, and 5. 1–16—*Then shall the righteous man stand in great boldness*; not to mention Prov. 3. 1–17—*Her ways are ways of pleasantness*—appointed for Sunday use by 1871, R.L. and A.L.

It is difficult to feel that we need reconcile ourselves to never again having such lessons as these read in church on a Sunday except when the Holy Days for which alone they are now appointed fall on Sundays *and* take precedence of them; and the more difficult, when among N.L.'s new insertions to be set against them are the story, vital though it is, of *Rahab the harlot*, Josh. 2 (not 1871, nor R.L. nor A.L.), Zech. 11—*Beauty, bands, and the thirty pieces of silver*—which, with the text as it is, seems too difficult for any congregation to follow; when all six of R.L.'s lessons from Amos are retained by N.L. and a seventh added (two being alternatives and one to be rarely read); and when three lessons, though also only as alternatives, can be included from Habbakuk.

To ponder some of the O.T. lessons appointed by N.L. (e.g. from the Prophets) or similar lessons in R.L. and A.L. may be to find

oneself asking again whether there is not need in the Church of England, alongside any standard lectionary, for an O.T. Sunday lectionary which prescribes lessons chosen primarily for their intelligibility, for use where desired (cf. Report No. 673 (1951), Convocation of Canterbury); and whether, until this need (if such it be) is met, some responsible incumbents, knowing their people as they do, will feel justified in abandoning their habit of selecting such lessons as they themselves think most appropriate. But this is not the moment to indulge any such doubt and, though it is hoped that the points raised above may be considered, there is no doubt that, in the difficult task of selection from as large a field of choice as the O.T. offers, the compilers of N.L. have shown remarkable judgment and discretion.

IV. Sundays: Lessons from N.T.

Any two-year Sunday lectionary can include the greater part of the N.T. Selection of lessons from it is therefore easier; but, even so, N.L. shows great sureness of touch in its choices.

When N.L. is introduced into churches in which R.L. has been in use, some may notice a considerable reduction in the number of lessons read from the Gospels. That will be because R.L. almost always prints a lesson from a Gospel above an alternative lesson from some other part of the N.T., with the result that in many churches the Gospel passage is almost always read as the second lesson and other parts of the N.T. are rarely heard. Both A.L. and N.L. rightly correct this practice and should be commended rather than blamed for so doing.

Happily, too, in dealing with the N.T., N.L. has been able to keep as lessons read on both a Sunday and a Holy Day a larger proportion of those hitherto read on both, than when dealing with the O.T. The only passage from the Gospels which some might miss, hitherto read on a Sunday but not included in N.L. for either Sunday or Holy Day, is John 8. 51–58 (R.L. and A.L.)—*Before Abraham was, I am* (Gospel, 5 Lent).

N.L. even manages to include some new insertions from the four Gospels, notably, on Sunday evenings in Lent every other year, a sequence of lessons from the later chapters of Luke similar to that appointed for the same evenings by R.L., A.L. and N.L. from the later chapters of Mark, and there is presumably some reason why both these sequences should be appointed for E.P. The Lucan version of the Sermon on the Mount is also to be read on a Sunday for the first time. Room is even made for the Lucan as well as the Matthaean version of what is known as the "Eschatological Discourse" (R.L. the former, A.L. neither); but, by the only mistake of the sort noticed, the Lucan version is appointed for 26 Trinity M.P., only two weeks before the Matthaean version is appointed to be read, also at M.P.; but as another 26 Trinity will not recur until 1967 there is time enough in which to put this right, and perhaps to reconsider this insertion? Two less well-known passages from Matthew 23 (vv. 8–10 and 16–22)—*Be not ye called Rabbi* and

Swearing by the altar—are also for the first time included in a Sunday lesson, though it also will not be heard until 1967!

It is remarkable how many lessons N.L. contrives to include from Acts, though 11. 1–18 (A.L.)—*Peter's vision at Joppa*—must now be "Holy Day only", as also 26. 1–23 (A.L.)—*Paul before Agrippa*; 21. 15–36—*Paul rescued by Roman soldiers*—is newly inserted, as also, happily, are 19. 21–end—*Diana of the Ephesians*—and 25. 1–12 (13–end)—*Paul's appeal unto Caesar.*

1 Cor. 13 will be read under N.L. once in two years instead of twice (or possibly four times) under R.L. and twice (or possibly thrice) under A.L., and it may be noted that 1 Tim. 1. 12–2. 8—*I exhort therefore that supplications*—is given an extra verse.

Heb. 13. 1–21—*Great Shepherd of the sheep,* James 4—*What is your life?*—and 1 Pet. 3. 8–end—*Finally be ye all like-minded* (all R.L. but not A.L.) are welcome re-insertions; and, as Rev. 7. 9–end (A.L.)—*After these things I saw and, behold, a great multitude*—is read as a lesson and in part as Epistle (or lection) on All Saints', as well as a lesson in the Burial Service, its claim to be read on a Sunday also can hardly be pressed.

Indeed, there is even less to question in the selection of lessons from the N.T. by the authors of N.L. than there is in their selection from the O.T., and much more to admire than to dispute.

V. Holy Days and Special Occasions

N.L. makes many more changes in lessons for Holy Days than might have been expected and than it makes in those for Sundays, in proportion to their numbers, and also makes many new insertions; and, here again, it seems on the whole singularly happy in its choices. Some of these last must, if only for reasons of space, be left to be discovered, and comment still more severely restrained.

Baruch 4. 21–27—*Be of good cheer, O my children*—is an interesting reversion to 1871 on Innocents, as is also Col. 2. 8–15—*Circumcision not made with hands*—in place of Rom. 13 (R.L. and A.L.) on Circumcision. Josh. 1. 1–9 (A.L.)—*Be strong and of a good courage*—with its sideway glance at New Year, is now to hearten the faithful as they enter on Sundays after Trinity.

Some may miss Heb. 1 (R.L. and A.L.) on Ascension Day itself, as distinct from the previous evening.

On St Andrew the insertion by N.L. of 1 Cor. 4. 9–16—*A spectacle unto the world*—not hitherto appointed for Sunday or Holy Day, is a real gain; but on St Thomas it might be less confusing to begin 1 Pet. 1. 1–9 at verse 3?

On St Matthias, 1 Sam. 16. 1–13 (R.L. and A.L.)—*Anointing of David*—is perhaps suitably replaced by 1 Sam. 15. 16–29—*Thy Kingdom given to a neighbour* (R.L. on a Sunday). John 1. 43–end on St Philip and St James; Job 29. 11–16—*Eyes to the blind*—and Tobit 4. 5–11—*Alms*—on St Barnabas; Judg. 13. 1–7—*Manoah and the Nazarite vow* (new insertion) on St John Baptist, and Acts 9, 32–end—*Dorcas* (new insertion) on St Peter all seem somewhat

better placed than the lessons from R.L. or A.L. or both for which they are substituted.

For St Mary Magdalene N.L. appoints Isa. 25. 1–9—*This is our God and he will save us*—instead of A.L.'s perhaps too audacious Song of Songs 3. 1–4 (b)—*I held him and would not let him go*. On St Simon and St Jude, Jer. 3. 12–18—*I will give you shepherds*—which might begin better at v. 11?—is another reversion to 1871; and 1 Maccabees 2, with its mention of "Simon and Judas", which some have thought mischievous and others providential, is now excluded.

On All Saints, Wisdom 2. 23–3. 9 must surely begin at 3. 1 or 2. 21? The transference of 2 Esdras 2. 42–end—*Stood so stiffly for the name*—from Remembrance Sunday to this Day is noteworthy; but it may also be noted that, dropping out here, Isa. 33. 13–17—*Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty* (1871, R.L. and A.L. somewhere)—finds no place in the N.L. and probably cannot.

As to Special Occasions, Ecclus. 51. 1–12—*Out of many afflictions* (another N.L. insertion)—will need not to be used in isolation on Remembrance Sunday, lest it seem too self-regarding in a commemoration of the fallen; and some slight risk of occasional confusion might be removed if, under the title "*St Andrew's Tide and other missionary occasions*", it was made clear that Zech. 8. 20–end is a lesson, and Rom. 10. 9–15 the Epistle, for St Andrew's Day?

Both of N.L.'s insertions on Thanksgiving for Harvest should be useful, viz. Joel 2. 21–27—*Fear not, O land*—and Luke 12. 13–34 (? 31), the latter running a negligible risk of "near approach" to the Gospel for 15 Trinity. It may be added here that extensive examination has not revealed any "collision", nor even any too near approach that matters, between any lesson appointed by N.L. for a Sunday and any lesson thus appointed for a Holy Day, nor yet between either and any Epistle or Gospel for a Sunday or Holy Day, though Matt. 6. 19–end, 14 Trinity, E.P., Year I, anticipates somewhat closely the Gospel for the following Sunday? The Gospel for St Luke's Day could fall to be read as a Sunday lesson on the previous day, but at most once in a century, and rarely so often!

VI. Conclusion

Here this survey must end. Of necessity so summary as to be virtually unreadable, it may yet, it is hoped, suffice to show that in their selection of lessons from the Bible, for Sundays and Holy Days alike, the compilers of N.L. put themselves increasingly beyond the reach of criticism. They will no doubt consider in due course whether any period of less than four years can really give time for N.L. to be tested by use and for suggestions and comments on it to be formulated, sent in, considered and, if favoured, embodied. Nothing much is to be gained nowadays by haste in giving a lectionary statutory authority?

Will the compilers also consider whether, if only by one more preliminary note, they should not indicate, as A.L. does, that, pend-

ing the acceptance by the Church of another and better, some of the lessons which they appoint really *ought* to be read from the Revised Version, e.g. the first lesson for Christmas morning, Isa. 9. 2–7, the meaning of which in part the Authorized Version so painfully obscures?

The perfect lectionary—perhaps even the near-perfect lectionary—still eludes us. If it is to be given us, it may well await the fixing of Easter, a new version of the Bible and, above all, the coming of one possessed by the Spirit, whose insight into the significance of the Scriptures for the Church, and for man's understanding of himself and his experience, is so profound as to enable him to harmonize many conflicting principles and interpretations. Meanwhile, this *New Lectionary* is so good that it is well worth sufficient time and thought being given to make it, as it surely might be, even a little better still. Judged only by the way in which they have saved the efforts of years from ending in frustration, or judged only by the selection that they have made of lessons for Sundays and Holy Days, its authors have done, in Nehemiah's words, "a great work": and, however slightly this lectionary is in due course amended, it should not only, as they modestly hope and if with such reservations as have been suggested above, "be well accepted and approved by all . . . conscientious sons of the Church of England", but also be of much service, in the way of guidance and example, to other Christian communions throughout the world.

MERVYN HAIGH.

Letter from Italy

SINCE theology has its territorial boundaries just as it has its historical periods, an introduction of theological geography will be useful in describing the present-day theological situation in Italy. We must in fact distinguish two theological zones in this country: the one a concentration of theologians and higher schools of theology in Rome, the centre of the Catholic world, and the other composed of a few score of more or less professional theological scholars scattered throughout the rest of the peninsula, especially in the north. These latter are sometimes grouped together around some circle or institute or round some periodical of religious studies as in Florence, Genoa, Piacenza, Venegono, Milan, Turin, Brescia or Padua.

The Roman group plays a part of the highest importance in the Church, a part for which it has trained itself and to which it has accustomed itself ever more completely, especially since the modernist crisis at the beginning of this century and since the more recent reform of ecclesiastical studies introduced by the Apostolic Constitution *Deus, scientiarum Dominus* of 1931. This explains to a great extent the attitude which it has been accustomed to take up in the movement of contemporary theological thought. The theologians of Rome are, for the most part, teachers in one or other of the colleges

for the higher theological training of the young clergy, who forgather in the Eternal City from every part of the world. Their first care, therefore, is to give these young men a solid theological formation which, while it preserves in each his spiritual structure of Catholicism, at the same time ensures unity of belief and teaching in the various national centres of culture that throughout the Catholic world will be manned by the students of to-day. From this we get a large output of theological manuals in the Catholic institutions in Rome—practically every lecturer sets out to produce his own manual. These manuals possess all the merits and some of the inevitable defects of similar publications. One of the defects is the habit of confronting and dealing with new problems and new situations from a pedagogical point of view, that is to say, with the desire and aim of making it more easily, if not more thoroughly, understood by the pupil. In spite of this, several of these manuals have been not merely school books, but have furnished a rich contribution to Catholic thought at large. There were, for instance, the Commentaries on St Thomas Aquinas by L. Billot, S.J., and more recently those of R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., the unfinished "Manuale dogmaticae" by Dom A. Stoltz, O.S.B., the "Collectio theologica romana", published by the College of Propaganda Fide, the "De Incarnatione ac Redemptione", by P. Galtier, S.J., and the "De Ecclesia Christi" of T. Zapelena, S.J.

No less important in the interests of theology is the service which these theologians render to the Church in the opposite direction. For, besides promoting a more pronounced theological uniformity in the Catholic world, they reflect on the Apostolic See itself the catholicity of theological thought. They must cause to converge upon a centre the individual theological enterprises of the whole Catholic world and present them to the Church's teaching body with a view to their being incorporated in the spiritual structure of Catholicism. Undoubtedly the attitude taken by the Roman theological system imparts a special feature to the eventual appreciation of these theological experiments, often a touch of equilibrium and sobriety, which is to the advantage of the experiments themselves, for it ensures their contribution gaining sooner or later their proper position in Catholic thought, which would not have been achieved by a monopoly of theological views, perhaps brilliant, but also hasty and one-sided. Besides, the teaching body itself brings together in Rome a considerable representative group, which attracts exponents of all the more important Catholic theological traditions, each of which has its own chair in one of the Roman theological colleges and each has its own periodical organ. Thus we can easily discern even in Rome itself a considerable variety of theological thought, and this even in official Thomism, which in the "Angelicum" University of the Dominican Fathers is that traditional Thomist school as handed down by Cajetan, while at the Gregorian University of the Jesuit Fathers it will be enriched with Suarezian references, and in the "Antonianum" Institute of the Friars Minor and in the Theological Faculty of the Conventual Franciscans it will advantageously take

up its arguments with valuable elements culled from the theology of St Bonaventure and Duns Scotus. Those institutes which do not possess a theological tradition of their own, like the College of Propaganda Fide and the Lateran Seminary, are remarkable for their characteristic understanding of Thomism, if only because they make use of the text of Aquinas himself.

This diversity and other differences still more interesting, which give colour to the picture of Catholic thought as presented by the various Roman theologians, come out in their teaching and still more in their publications and the discussions that take place at theological conferences, which are held very frequently in Rome and are specially expressive of Catholic thought, like those held at the Gregorian University in 1948, 1951 and 1953, the Mariological ones of 1950 and 1954, and the recent one on Thomist philosophy held in September 1955. An example was the discussion on Mary's part in Christ's work of redemption at the International Mariological Congress in 1950 and that on her obligation to contract original sin in that of 1954 when two unyielding doctrinal camps appeared on the scene. Another theological contest, which was more personal and made a greater impression—although it had its roots in the opposing philosophical theses of past centuries among Thomists, Scotists and Suarezians—was that which was fought out, and is not yet completely appeased, between Mgr Pietro Parente, now Archbishop of Perugia, and Fr Paul Galtier, S.J., of the Gregorian University, about the delicate problem of Christ's human psychology.

This then is the theological situation in Rome, fundamentally created by a major pedagogical and doctrinal responsibility towards the Catholic world; but we must look outside the Eternal City for the more truly national marks of Italian theology. The most common difficulty that Italian theology has to meet is the atmosphere of indifference and often, too, of contempt and hostility, against which it comes up in present-day Italian culture. This was brought into existence by anti-Catholic spiritual forces, which managed to prevail in this country at any rate since the time of the political unification of the Italians in 1870 and deprived Catholic thought of that position of guide, which it had continually held for centuries, creating a situation, which was later rendered more serious by the internal crisis of Catholic thought during the Modernist phase, particularly acute in Italy.

The revival, which is undoubtedly taking place to-day, is to a great extent the result of the all-round revival of Catholic thought that has been invigorated afresh by a return to the scholastic tradition (cf. Leo XIII's encyclical "Aeterni Patris" of 1879) which in Italy has found two able champions in the *Rivista di Filosofia neoscolastica*, founded at Florence in 1906, but now published in Milan, and *Divus Thomas* of the Alberoni College at Piacenza, to say nothing of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, the most widely read of all the Italian religious reviews. The theological schools of Rome, which cannot be said to be isolated from the rest of the country, have contributed and still contribute much to Italian religious culture. It is something of

a paradox that it is precisely the most international Roman institute, the College of Propaganda Fide, which has most often taken up theological questions of national interest with its compact body of eminent theologians all of Italian nationality, P. Parente, A. Piolanti, S. Garofalo and C. Fabro. Nor must we undervalue the authority in Italian circles, which are on the whole hostile to Catholic thought, of non-scholastic Catholic thinkers, especially French ones like M. Blondel, G. Marcel, L. Lavelle and R. Le Senne. In the same way an Italian of former times, A. Rosmini (1797–1855), is still an inspiration to lay Catholic thinkers in Italy. Amongst the latter we are struck by the considerable number and the high intellectual standard of those who come from non-Catholic intellectual surroundings and with their convert's enthusiasm and their versatility do much to introduce more Catholic thought into present-day Italian culture. And so we see ever larger groups of lay representatives of Italian Catholic thought forming around institutions, which may include even the State Universities, no longer closed to them, or present from time to time at conferences like the philosophical ones at Gallarate or those for Catholic graduates at Camaldoli, or again publishing learned reviews such as *Humanitas* and the *Giornale di Metafisica* of Michele Federico Sciacca, Mgr Maurizio Raffa's *Responsabilità del Sapere, Città di Vita* of Florence and *Studia Patavina* of Padua. One finds them lined up, almost invariably, in the ranks of neo-spiritual philosophers rather than in the neo-Thomism favoured by ecclesiastical philosophers and theologians.

Particularly interesting have been the attempts in these last years to introduce theology *en bloc* into modern Italian culture. The most ambitious of these has probably been the institution of theological studies for the laity, which began in 1945 and spread to various Italian cities, especially where there are a large number of university students, for whom it is made possible to complete their intellectual training with an adequate theological education, which should reach the same standard of scholarship as do the other university courses. In many cases it has been necessary to limit the programs to an occasional series of religious conferences; the institutes at Florence and Padua, each with a faithful handful of lay students, who take up the study of theology seriously, have gained much intellectual and pedagogical experience. Even before the war there existed at Milan an institution of this kind, the "Didaskaleion", under the shadow of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, which, like all the Italian State Universities, is without a theological faculty; lectures are given there by, amongst others, the professors of the Archbishop of Milan's seminary at Venegono under the direction of an expert theologian, who is much thought of in Italian university circles, Don Grazioso Ceriani. He is the author of a new theological course, of which Italian theology may be proud, centring on and expanding from the figure of Christ, and entitled "Christus hodie". It is in five volumes and a second edition will be published shortly. There is another "Didaskaleion" at Genoa thanks to the zeal of the Archbishop, H.E. Cardinal Joseph Siri, who himself has written a course of dogmatic

theology for laymen (1940–4). A few years previously were published the magnificent Italian manuals of theology by Mariano Cordovani, Ludovico Fanfani, O.P., and Mgr Francesco Olgiati, O.P.

Don Giovanni Rossi works hard and successfully at imparting a rather more sentimental and aesthetic presentation of theology at his institute "Pro Civitate Christiana" founded at Assisi in 1939. His theological message is characterized by its inexhaustible optimism and by its feeling of joy in contact with Christ, a feeling which permeates every department of life, thought, art and literature. This message can be heard by hundreds of intellectual young Italians, who are continually making pilgrimages to Assisi and are made welcome at the "Christian Citadel" for religious festivals, congresses, retreats and artistic exhibitions. The work is intensified every year at the end of August during courses of Christian studies, which up till now have dealt with the various articles of the Creed and have been conducted both by professional theologians and by less orthodox and sometimes criticized ones. While following one of these courses one gets the impression that Don Giovanni Rossi's theological expression is the one that more easily reaches the most sensitive spot in the soul of an Italian, probably that same one which was discovered seven centuries ago by another citizen of Assisi, the "Poor little man" St Francis.

Naturally Italian theologians are alive to those problems that perturb their fellows in other countries. And in this connexion it must be said that they are generally well informed about the developments of theological thought, though often only indirectly so, through the theological reviews of the Roman institutes or through French publications. Information given for instance by *La Scuola Cattolica* of Venegono is remarkably complete and up to date; so too that of *Divus Thomas* of Piacenza and *Humanitas* of Brescia. Then there is the "Morcelliana" publishing house at Brescia, which specializes almost exclusively in the publication of the best works of foreign religious thought. This makes it possible for Italian theologians to cull some of the best conclusions of foreign theological work with a clear conscience. In this way, without ever taking part in the discussion over kerygmatic theology, several Italian theologians have known how to adapt their theology to the needs of a public that knows nothing of traditional scholastic language and system. There are the above-mentioned authors of theological manuals for the laity as well as C. Falconi with his "Cristo e l'Umanità" (1949) and the authors of the New Course of Catholic Theology in eight volumes, A. Piolanti, A. Beni, S. Cipriani, C. Colombo, D. Bertetto and I. Carbone, whose work is being published by the "Libreria Editrice Fiorentina". Something has also been done in the way of getting back to the *sources* of theology, the Bible, the Fathers and the Liturgy. A Holy Bible in forty-four volumes, translated with commentary by the best Italian Scripture scholars under the direction of Mgr Salvatore Garofolo, is well on its way to completion and will satisfy the most urgent needs of Italian Catholic thought by information on all the best achievements of the most

recent developments in biblical studies. The study of the *Fathers* is continually being intensified by the writings of Roman specialists in patristic studies and by the more national institutes, like that at Catania for the study of Christian antiquities and that of the Salesian Fathers at Turin, who have made the Fathers their traditional study and in particular edit a collection, the "Corona Patrum Salesiana", which already contains about thirty neat volumes of the original text with a translation and a commentary of the best works of the Latin and Greek Fathers.

The liturgical movement has by now reached the great mass of the faithful, especially through the Catholic Action associations, and it often expresses itself in a very intense parochial life centred on the altar. This has been considerably influenced, not only by works published abroad, but also by weighty historical studies such as "La Santa Messa nella Liturgia Romana" by G. Destefani (1935), Card. Ildefonso Schuster's "Liber Sacramentorum" (nine volumes, begun in 1919) and M. Righetti's "Storia Liturgica" (1944–5). There has been much activity in liturgical centres in Milan, Genoa and Parma and the eloquent witness of the catacombs and of other ancient Christian monuments. The recent success of D. Barsotti's "Il Mistero Cristiano nell' anno liturgico" (1951) demonstrates the existence of powerful theological currents flowing under the Italian liturgical movement.

The problem of the *union of the churches* also makes itself felt. Years ago, in 1911–13, Aurelio Palmieri with his "Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa" made a great contribution to Eastern ecclesiastical studies, but now a fuller knowledge of Eastern Christendom has been imparted to Italian theology, for the most part by the professors of the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies at Rome. They stir up interest in it by their lectures, they hold missions during the Octave of Prayer for the Union of the Churches (18–25 January) and they publish numerous writings. B. Schultze, S.J., by his articles on "Pensatori russi di fronte a Cristo", published in the *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1944–5 and then in book form, excited great interest at that time. Nearly all the theological reviews deal with ecumenical questions from time to time. A complete number of the *Scuola Cattolica* in 1949 was devoted to them and this was followed by the *mises au point* of S. Fruscioni, S.J., in the *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1950. There is also the bi-monthly review *Unitas*, which is expressly devoted to ecumenical questions under the editorship of Charles Boyer, S.J., whose well considered and sane eirenic spirit is much appreciated. Last year he published *Unità cristiana e movimento ecumenico*, a small but truly enlightening volume. He also wrote *Unus Pastor* in 1948 after M. Baronchelli had written *Ecumenismo cattolico* in 1947.

Abbé Roger Aubert in his theological survey of *La théologie catholique au milieu du XX^e siecle*, published in 1954, makes no mention of Italian theology, except for the fine Mariological treatise of G. Miegge, who is an Italian theologian of the Waldensian Church, but highly esteemed even by his Catholic colleagues. The

foregoing examples, however, together with many others, which have not been mentioned, show that Italian Catholic theologians also undertake their work very seriously. If their contribution to the general movement of Catholic thought is little known outside Italy, I think this is not due to its small size or to its poor quality, but rather by reason of a particular cause, to which I should like to draw attention in concluding this letter. These theologians in fact do not take part in searching out and defining new problems, which to-day present themselves to Catholic thought all over the world. They prefer to proceed directly to look for a solution of these problems and they do it in an always well considered and often effective way. But this contribution of theirs would certainly be better recognized and more appreciated if it comprised the examination of the initial stages of the theological work of their colleagues, for it is often here that is to be found the essential material for a satisfactory solution.

GEORGE ELDAROV.

The Intellectual Vocation of the Christian

EVERY trade or profession has its peculiar responsibilities, and what these are the novice has of course to learn. But in regard to those pursuits which we describe as intellectual is there not a further, more general responsibility shared by all, if not by all equally? Has not the thinker, the scientist, the scholar a duty to society at large, to the cultural tradition which he inherits, to the life of reason itself? And what if the "intellectual" be also a Christian believer? Has he not then an enhanced responsibility, not only to his fellows but to God? Yet how exactly is this Christian responsibility to be understood: in what respect does it differ from the responsibility either of the intellectual who is a non-believer or of the believer who is not an intellectual? To maintain that there is such a distinctive responsibility and to study its manifold implications seems to me, in view alike of present-day evangelistic needs and of certain current trends in theology, an undertaking of singular importance.

How does a conviction of the truth of Christianity increase (or diminish) the intellectual's responsibility *qua* intellectual? In order to give as much point to the question as possible let us specify the case of the intellectual *par excellence*: the philosopher. It is sometimes objected that were he to accept the Christian revelation as a finally authoritative declaration of truth he would thereby at once surrender his freedom as a thinker. But since to uphold the autonomy of reason is his primary obligation the philosopher who thus permits its circumscription is no longer a philosopher. An alternative view, however, may be that as a believer he now assumes an additional obligation: he is a thinker *plus* a believer and has to carry the special responsibilities of both.

Each of these views seems to me to be mistaken. One's intellectual responsibilities cannot be treated in this merely quantitative or arithmetical way. A Christian philosopher who has taken due account of his proper task is not, I would contend, any less a philosopher than his non-believing colleague. Similarly his duty is not simply to be a believer supplementary to his being a philosopher. The Christian thinker—the Christian rationalist, if you like—is committed *ipso facto* to a *new kind* of responsibility, as we shall shortly see.

But here I must indicate an essential contrast between the responsibility of the non-believer—the scientific humanist, for example—and that of the man of faith. The humanist becomes aware of an obligation partly to himself, partly to society, which he might even describe as a matter of conscience. He feels that it is up to him to take an *initiative*, he must bestir himself to a work of service. To the Christian, on the other hand, responsibility does not present itself in this way. For him it is God who takes the initiative. His own duty is to respond, to obey. God's initiative, as he has been taught to see it, lies in the Incarnation and Atonement. The divine action has been such, that is to say, that everything we think or do is always inevitably either a response or a refusal. One cannot dodge the issue. A Christian therefore regards his responsibility—which derives from the relationship in which he stands to God—as having a quite special significance and urgency. A man's obligations in life are not, he would say, a matter simply of his conscientiously doing his job to the best of his ability. They spring from his recognition of the fact that every situation in which he finds himself presents a challenge from God. Thus the nature of moral obligation appears to the believer in a quite different light from that in which it appears to the non-believer. Whereas the one thinks of himself as "free", the other thinks of himself as "under orders".

The divine call is in itself the same for all men: to this the Bible bears the plainest witness. But it comes to them in an infinite variety of ways, according to the life-situation of each. Conditioned by race, nationality, family, occupation, temperament, above all perhaps by one's point in time, it is this which determines the form and character of the individual's response. It is here and now, in his existing circumstances that the Christian learns to recognize his vocation. For him nothing about these circumstances is merely fortuitous. They are the place where he encounters God.

The profession of faith, when more than merely "notional", is never a reach-me-down affair, ready-made and identical for all. It is intrinsically personal, and no two persons are the same. Even in the life of the individual his response will change with changing conditions, which make new demands upon him and confront him with new opportunities. No man can answer God's call except in and by way of the special circumstances which constitute his vocation. The intellectual accordingly makes his response as an intellectual. Were he to try to forget or deny his *métier* he would only be evading the call—*his* call. He would, in other words, have made the common mistake of distinguishing his mundane responsibility from his re-

sponsibility to God. And from this abiding error comes the familiar and false antithesis of sacred and secular, of religious obligations which have no significance for the world and worldly obligations which have no significance for religion. When however we comprehend the true meaning of Christian responsibility we cannot, I submit, avoid the conclusion that for the Christian intellectual the service of the intellect is his personal vocation. How, then, does he fulfil it?

Perhaps we should first ask, How does he recognize it? Recognition is not automatic. To profess belief in God is not, in itself, very difficult. But to realize this profession by expressing it in the appropriate manner is far from easy. For the intellectual in the world of to-day it poses a large and complex problem. Can faith and reason ever be fully integrated? Is it indeed any longer possible for a man to believe *as* an intellectual, so that his faith is a spur and not an obstacle to the assumption of his intellectual task? If not, his faith, it seems, will show itself as no more than a way out of his obligations. The case of the man of high intelligence who believes apart from, or even in spite of, his rational understanding is not, regrettably, altogether unfamiliar. As a Christian he has missed his vocation. (In the controversy occasioned some time ago by a B.B.C. broadcast it was disquieting to remark how often professing believers hastened to point out that faith and reason are disparate.)

In fact the exercise of faith in any other way than through the medium of one's particular vocation may be a form of irresponsibility. So too is the assumption of apparent "responsibilities" apart from faith. Humanism is irresponsibility towards God. Man's common fault—his *sin*, let us frankly acknowledge—is first and mainly his failure to respond to or even heed the divine call; but also, having heard it, in not responding to it rightly, in not accepting the specific challenge with which the divine action faces him. The sin, I suggest, to which the Christian intellectual is especially liable is in *not* using his intellect in the service of God, in evading the responsibility to which his vocation commits him. That this is no mere paradox can be readily shown.

The intellectual who becomes a Christian, or at any rate who realizes the claim upon him of a faith which hitherto has lain dormant, runs a twofold risk: either he entertains no doubt at all about the rectitude and competence of the intellect as a wholly autonomous faculty upon which "sin" has no bearing, or else he increasingly fears and despises it as a will-o'-the-wisp, a false trail, the devil's most insidious trick. In the one case he sees his "natural" reason as having no need of redemption; in the other, as being incapable of it. He may not succumb to either error in its extreme form, but he never easily finds the path which avoids both.

Yet it is this path only which is the way of responsibility, as we shall see in a moment. In reply, however, to the adherents of both these extreme views it should be said, on the one hand, that the reason and understanding of the "natural" man are not excluded from the total condition of his sinfulness, and on the other, that it

is a mistake to try to specify wherein in particular his sinfulness lies. But the intellectual will certainly be guilty of failure before God—and so also therefore to man—if he should neglect or repudiate the way of true responsibility.

At this point it is relevant to say a word about the immemorial problem of faith and reason. Despite the endless discussion which it has provoked it has never, it seems, been solved to the general satisfaction of Christian thinkers; mainly because, as I venture to suggest, it has usually been misconceived. Faith and reason have been regarded as two distinct entities whose exact relationship can be defined *in abstracto*; as two realms of the spirit whose authority ought never to overlap and whose frontiers can, with patience, be determinately settled. We even speak of them as "faculties" of the mind, operating in alternation: respecting the things of religion "faith" is to apply, whereas for mundane affairs "reason" suffices. But so stated the problem is fictitious. I would myself say that there is no problem of faith and reason except for the conscience of the *believer* who also is keenly alive to the exigencies of reason; or—which amounts to the same thing—of the *thinker* who feels the necessity of integrating his personal faith with his conception of life and the world. For the thinker who does not feel the impact of belief, or for the believer who does not perceive the importunity of the rational intelligence, there can be no such problem. But so soon ever as we become aware of this twofold demand the attempt to answer it satisfactorily appears to us, quite unavoidably, to be the way of our responsibility.

For the deeply religious mind the temptation to belittle the intellect is sometimes very strong. The natural reason seems to it to be the unfailing source of doubts and of pride—of *hubris*—and its pretensions the very thing which faith needs to curb, even to humiliate. The believer loses confidence in the intellect and in its achievements, however admirable. Hence the frequent objection on the part of Christians—not widespread, perhaps, but where it occurs deep-rooted and insistent—to *philosophy*, "that rash interpreter of the divine nature and order", as Tertullian called it. "After Jesus Christ," the same writer warns us, "we desire no subtle theories, after the Gospel no acute inquiries."[1] For those who think thus the very notion of a *Christian* philosophy is self-contradictory. The *sacrificium intellectus* of which Kierkegaard speaks then becomes a necessary condition of obedience. Faith alone can supply the *epignosis* which we really have need of, the answer to all our legitimate questionings.

Unhappily this view of the matter goes far towards justifying those who denounce religious belief as an obstruction of the reason, and who, in their turn, argue that philosophy can never come to terms with it.[2] But if faith and reason are in truth incompatibles then the

[1] *De praescr. haeret.*, vii.

[2] "C'est par accident que, pendant les siècles du Moyen Age, la culture intellectuelle d'origine grecque a été liée étroitement avec la profession religieuse. La philosophie, à la fin de l'antiquité, a été platonicienne; le rationalisme

only conclusion to be drawn—and many to-day do draw it—is that the believer cannot, in so far as he is a believer, be an "intellectual", any more than can an intellectual, in so far as he is an intellectual, be a believer. If this dilemma is valid the future of Christianity is certain: it must sooner or later peter out in ignorance and superstition.

The dilemma, however, is not valid. On the one hand faith, for the Christian, is God-given. On the other, man's reason is an excellent thing. Nevertheless reason has to be challenged: not by "faith"—which, in strictness, can never be other than *our* faith—but by God. Reason, that is to say, is subject to the sentence of condemnation which God passes on the "natural" man, whole and entire, because of his sin. But with the condemnation of sin goes also the redemption of the sinner, who thereafter is called upon to assume his full responsibilities before God. And of these none is superior to that of his reason. In the shadow of Calvary man's rational intelligence itself acquires an enhanced authority and new obligations. So far from relinquishing its proper autonomy it gains fresh confidence and is braced to adventure upon further tasks.

This statement needs some enlargement. For the Christian thinker reason's self-confidence is warranted. But he would be quite as sure that the self-confidence of "natural" reason—the intelligence of the unregenerate man—is not. The relationship of what St Paul calls the "new man" to God makes all the difference. Moreover, the believer, in submitting his natural reason to question, is not criticizing it after the manner of philosophical scepticism. He is not concerned merely to discover its limits. What does concern him is the new use to which it may be put when the human personality is suffused with the grace of God. In other words, a man's reason must be crucified that it may rise again from the dead. The believer re-discovers the function of the intellect through his faith in the promises of Christ. Redemption no more involves the abandonment of reason than it does the annihilation of human nature. Reason must first be "judged" because it manifests man's sin, which is a *total* condition of his being; but because grace perfects nature—makes it what, in creating it, God intended it to be—it also authenticates reason.

Has the believer then given up anything of the autonomy of his rational understanding? His belief is a source of joy because he finds in it illumination, hope and strength. This, the essence of Christian experience, is not a thing which can be adequately described for the benefit of one who has himself not known it; for there is no knowledge of Christ apart from Christ. Has it, however, been purchased at a price? Has the freedom of the uncommitted intelligence been lost in the process of conversion? Surely not. Rather, as Pascal reminds us, there is nothing so conformable to reason as this dis-

d'Aristote a dominé au xiiie siècle; au xvii siècle est né un nouvel intellectualisme, issu génie grec; au xixe siècle s'imposent les problèmes sociaux, avec l'antithèse de la sociocratie du christianisme; il n'a pas la moindre affinité avec lui . . . on ne peut pas plus parler d'une philosophie chrétienne que d'une mathématique chrétienne ou d'une physique chrétienne" (Emile Brehier, *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, April–June 1931, pp. 161 f.).

avowal of reason. If a believer retains his trust in intellectual values it is not because he has by "revelation", or external authority of any kind, been told to do so in spite of every misgiving that he himself might entertain. It is the same intuitive certitude that reason is a reliable guide which the non-believer also claims to possess, and is drawn from reason itself. Why indeed should it not be autonomous even for a Christian? Though man has perverted it, God made it. It is precisely this truth which a Christian recognizes, and should he himself be an "intellectual" he must welcome the responsibility which awaits him to make plenary use of it.

But clearly it is a responsibility not easily assumed. The believer awakens to it only at a particular point in his spiritual development: when, namely, he has through the impact of faith lost confidence in the sufficiency of natural reason, but has not so far reacted *against* the claims of the intelligence as to feel that henceforth faith itself demands of him a total sacrifice of the intellect. It becomes possible only when he is fully conscious that the rational understanding has itself a part to play within the dispensation of grace. The temptation, however, to subdue reason to faith is a powerful one because it appears so often to be the authentically Christian course to pursue. On the other hand, although for both believer and non-believer the objects upon which reason works, the tasks to which it addresses itself, are the same, yet their angles of approach are widely different. They differ even when confronting the common problems of everyday life. Yet it is also the fact that the believing intellectual and the believing non-intellectual—if I may so term him—although they share the same faith, have as Christians diverse spheres of responsibility. Both must give their answer to the divine call at the place where God encounters them. The unreflecting faith, the implicit belief, of the one will not suffice for the other. The child-like heart indeed is always necessary. But the adult, developed, percipient understanding—for this too there is a divine purpose. *Et diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex tota mente tua.*

Bernard M. G. Reardon.

The Dies Irae

There is some practical interest in the availability of a translation of the *Dies Irae*, since there are Churches where it is used in masses for the dead. There is a version for singing which, with perhaps more ingenuity than grace, achieves the double rhyme all through; but it is not easy to read without a blush, when there is no music to bear it out. Perhaps the following might be found more suitable for recitation in a speaking voice.

That day, the day of anger, must
Prove old prophetic warning just
And terminate the years in dust.

A quaking ground, a reeling sky
Will wait the certain scrutiny
Of him who comes their cause to try

When the trump's unearthly tone
Wakes within the grave the bone
And gathers all before the throne.

Though death recoils and nature cries,
Yet the creature shall arise
To answer at the last assize.

The book, once open, will rehearse
Whatever merits weal or curse
Throughout the summoned universe.

Seated high, the Judge will reign;
All that's hidden will be plain
And no unrighted wrongs remain.

What advocate can I command,
What plea, alas, shall take in hand
When the righteous hardly stand?

O King of fear and majesty,
Saving whom thou savest free,
Fount of pity, pity me.

Remember all thy arduous way
In quest of me, and hear me pray:
Lose not the found on judgment-day.

Thou soughtest me with toil and pain,
Thou hungest on the tree to gain
My pardon, surely not in vain.

Remit, my creditor and king,
Before the day of reckoning
The dues I owe and cannot bring.

As guilty found, I mourn my case,
Shame is burning in my face;
Lord, let thy suppliant find grace.

For thou in sinful Mary shriven
And the dying thief forgiven
Showest me a hope of heaven.

Weigh not the worthless prayer I frame;
Have mercy—Mercy is thy name—
And spare me everlasting flame.

When sheep and goats to either hand
Separate at thy command,
Bid me on the right to stand.

When sin, her malice manifest,
Flees to fires that never rest,
Fold me, Shepherd, with the blest.

In ashes to my God I bend;
A broken heart none else can mend
Cries: Compassionate my end.

Ah, remorseful day that must
Reanimate our sinful dust
And speak the ultimate award!
Spare thy handiwork, good Lord.

Jesu, king of mercy,
Grant them rest everlasting.

AUSTIN FARRER.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Haigh was Bishop of Winchester from 1942 to 1952.

Father G. Eldarov of the Order of the Conventual Friars Minor is Professor of Eastern Theology in their College of St Bonaventura at Rome.

The Rev. B. M. G. Reardon is Rector of Kelly, Lifton, Devon.

Dr Farrer is Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The Rev. Adrian Carey wishes to "demand that whatever the (quite proper) variety of modes of worship within Ecclesia Anglicana throughout the world, in this one central act there should be the uniformity which we have loved long since and lost awhile". If he attempts to do so, he will be *ultra vires*. Not even the Primate of all England is in a position to *demand* that the American Church, the Japanese, Indian, or Chinese Churches, or even (I imagine) the provinces of South, Central, or West Africa should place the Communion uniformly in "the central position to which it was moved in 1552"; and in fact it is well known both that the Communion does not have this position in the Scottish Liturgy, the South African or American rites, the new experimental Japanese rite, or some of the Chinese rites, *and* that there is slight possibility of these Churches acceding to demands, or even requests, from the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

I, too, would go further. With one or two exceptions, such as the Malabar-inspired "An Indian Liturgy", authorized liturgical revision of the Eucharistic rite has so far proceeded within the 1549–52 tradition: within, that is, the Anglican version of the Western European understanding and use of the Eucharist. There is disquieting evidence that in other cultural traditions this results in the Eucharist

being celebrated indeed, but not fully *used* or *done* by the local member of the Body of Christ because the manner of doing it which has come to it is one which it cannot effectively use.

Any missionary can illustrate the problem from his own experience. If Mr Carey doubts it, he might look at Dr Parrinder's *Religion in an African City*; and consider these sentences from Fr J. Daniélou: "I cannot conceive how African Negroes could praise God without dancing, for the dance is so much a part of their being that it is an integral part of their civilization. . . . How could we impose the Roman Mass on them—this silent Mass, so obviously Western, so sober, so inward, so discreet, so reserved, wherein the mightiest religious feelings find expression in perfect decorum" (*The Salvation of the Nations*, p. 39), since what Fr Daniélou says of the Roman Mass might be said in so many words by many a devout Anglican communicant of the Early Service.

This is, admittedly, a very delicate and difficult problem for the Anglican Communion, "since the Book of Common Prayer has been, and is, so strong a bond of unity throughout the whole Anglican Communion that great care must be taken to ensure that revisions of the Book shall be in accordance with the doctrine . . . of the Anglican Communion" (Lambeth Conference Report, 1948, resolution 78 (*a*)). That Conference's resolution ran in full "in accordance with the doctrine and *accepted liturgical worship* of the Anglican Communion" but "accepted liturgical worship" is precisely the problem. May we hope that in 1958, and before it, there may everywhere be critical consideration of our present "accepted liturgical worship", of the criticisms and proposed reforms (as well as revisions) that may be advanced in this country or not, and above all of what we think we are doing or ought to be doing when we celebrate the Eucharist together? And that parish and people may be involved as well as dons and bishops?

This consideration is going on in this country (this present correspondence is part of it). It is urgent that it should take place in Africa and the East—and especially perhaps in Africa; and above all corporately in the Anglican Communion as a whole. Nationalist feeling, if nothing else, will ensure that the Book of Common Prayer, 1662, is less and less an effective creator of unity. We seem to be called therefore to a large and creative effort to achieve some common understanding of what we are doing which will enable us cheerfully to hold together an increasing variety of ways of doing it. At that level, I fancy that Mr Carey and I might well be at one. Some such effort is needed if the Anglican inheritance is not to be dissipated before the Anglican mission is complete. To quote Lambeth 1948 again: "As Anglicans we believe that God has entrusted to us in our Communion not only the Catholic faith but a special service to render to the whole Church. Reunion of any part of our Communion with other denominations in its own area must make the resulting Church no longer simply Anglican, but something more comprehensive. . . . The Anglican Communion would be merged in a much larger Communion of National or Regional Churches, in full com-

munion with one another, united in all the terms of what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral" (*Report*, p. 22). That Quadrilateral does not mention the Book of Common Prayer.

Yours faithfully,
DAVID M PATON.

YARDLEY WOOD VICARAGE,
BIRMINGHAM 14.
9 *February* 1956.

SOCIETY OF ST AMBROSE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Theology and liturgy are to-day recognized, as they have not been for a long time past, as being closely bound up together. We feel, therefore, that some readers of THEOLOGY may be interested in the Society of St Ambrose for Liturgical Studies, an interdenominational group, governed by a committee representing Anglican, Roman Catholic and Methodist members, now entering upon its third year of existence in this country. As some indication of its work, during the past year papers have been given on Jewish Worship, the Psalms in Christian Worship, Methodism and Liturgy; the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, the Social Significance of Liturgy; the Roman Rite, and the Communion Office of the Church of South India. Most of these papers have been printed in the Bulletin of the Society, and as far as possible they have been given by members of the Communion whose worship was being discussed.

The Society is not a "learned society" and our work is of an elementary nature; but should any of your readers be interested we should be pleased to let them have further information.

Yours faithfully,
(The Rev.) G. P. T. PAGET KING,
Chairman.

16 ABERDEEN ROAD,
HIGHBURY,
LONDON, N.5.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY. By T. M. Parker. A. and C. Black. 21s.

When the Reverend John Bampton, M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford, and Canon of Salisbury died in 1757 he left his estate to the University of Oxford for the foundation of eight "Divinity Lecture Sermons" (the title is his own) to be preached annually in St Mary's with precise directions as to the electors, their place of meeting, persons eligible, times of preaching and classes of subjects from which choice was to be made. It is a far cry from 1780, when the series was actually begun by Dr James Bandinel of Jesus College, to

1950, Mr Parker's year, for the present volume which, after long gestation, has at least appeared in printed form. Many of its predecessors have become justly famous, and the long series of titles may be studied with curious interest for the light which they throw on the shifting emphasis and currency of ideas and the "topoi" of succeeding generations. His own work is entitled to a distinguished place, as it traces in turn developments from Biblical conceptions of Church and State to Reformation ecclesiology and the State and surveys the Pre-Constantinian Church, the Constantinian Revolution and the Christian Roman Empire and Byzantine Theocracy and, by contrast far more than by imitation, the Western Church and the Post-Roman World, the Medieval Attempt at Papal Theocracy and the Break-up of the Medieval World. The chapter divisions thus indicated form in each case a prelude to an admirable series of History Lectures rather than "Divinity Lecture Sermons", since "texts" have been deemed unnecessary and the homiletic element has been reduced to the barest minimum. No one can fairly deny to a lecturer the right to add liveliness to his treatment of his themes by the introduction of modern illustrations, and although some prosaic readers would perhaps wish that references to Marxists, Fifth Columns, British Israel, Boswell, Goering, Scottish and Irish football matches and the like had been replaced when the lectures were printed by fuller citations from original authorities, such as those which enrich Dr A. J. Carlyle's stately volumes on Medieval Political Theory, the present more determinedly compact book is entitled to a place of its own by its masterly summaries of what other, in many cases foreign, scholars have said about those authorities in many languages, with references to and quotations from their works, which will be found extremely useful. Mr Parker has an easy and enviable style which carries the reader's attention on with him, in spite of the rigorous compression, even if at times the student may say half-aloud, "Ah! I wish he had said more about that" or "I wonder what he would have said about" some topic which is unmentioned or barely hinted at.

It was once said by a distinguished lawyer of the sermons of a very notable preacher at Canterbury a generation ago: "At least he never insults our intelligence by pointing a moral." Not all hearers and probably still fewer readers of Bampton Lectures are likely to be distinguished lawyers, and some will read with regret Mr Parker's opening of his Epilogue: "It was not my intention to draw a moral from the tale I have tried to tell. To do so would be to run the risk of introducing a distorting element into what has striven to be as objective a treatment of the theme as possible." He goes on to suggest that "As I tried to study a subject of undoubted fascination and complexity, it has been borne in upon me more and more that the real problem of Church and State arises from one fact. Christianity is a religion not easily fitted into the categories of natural human life". That is indeed a subject for high debate; but it must have been in a fit of most uncharacteristic depression that he is led to close when speaking of the State by saying that "the problems before Christi-

anity in any foreseeable future is not that of adjustment to the State, but one of survival in the face of a State with ever-increasing claims and ambitions—until at last Leviathan collapses under his own weight".

Christ Church, Oxford. Claude Jenkins.

The Church in the New Testament Period. By Adolf Schlatter. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff. S.P.C.K. 21s.

Adolf Schlatter, who died in 1938, was a scholar of great distinction. Yet to many English-speaking students of the New Testament he was known only by hearsay, through the enthusiasm of such as the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns or Mr Noel Davey. The first of his books to be translated should, therefore, be read with great interest, especially in this outstandingly successful version by the late Dr Paul Levertoff. Of both these scholars Mr Noel Davey draws a movingly sympathetic sketch in his brief introductory note.

For its freshness and enthusiasm and its reverent spirit, this survey of the early years of the Church will immediately commend itself. Moreover, there are few matters of moment in the development of Christianity in this period which are not at least touched on here in a challenging and unusual way, sometimes arrestingly. The greatness of Schlatter's mind reveals itself from time to time in a terse aphorism such as: "Can an eschatologist be an historian?" This, as a pointer to the difference between Paul and Luke, makes one think. He goes his way with originality and independence; and his understanding of Judaism, shared also by his distinguished translator, makes his analysis of the Palestinian conflicts illuminating and important.

But Schlatter was not only original; his critical views were distinctly reactionary. And whereas this might positively add to the value and stimulus of his writing were it reinforced by argument and documentation, it becomes either misleading or exasperating when one is presented with sweeping statements unsupported by evidence and dogmatic conclusions without any apparent "working". He ascribes all the Johannine writings of the New Testament to the apostle, actually claiming that the Fourth Gospel's teaching on the Spirit "drove home the main lesson of the Apocalypse by clearing up the perplexities to which it had given rise". He assumes the Epistle of James to be the work of the Lord's brother, and Matthew's Gospel (prior to Luke) to be by the apostle. He speaks blandly of "the absence of any apologetic motive in the Gospels" and simply asserts that "like the other evangelists, St John wrote his Gospel for liturgical use". He traces the order of deacons, without more ado, to the Seven of Acts 6; and his conclusions about the leadership of Peter appear naïve in the extreme, in isolation from the learning which no doubt in fact underlies them.

Even when a modicum of argument is offered, it must be con-

fessed that it is sometimes questionable. On page 93 it is correctly stated that the Delphi inscription makes it probable that Gallio came to Achaea in the spring of 51; by page 156 "the new proconsul arrived"—no qualification—"in the early months of A.D. 51". Again, the complex problem of the conflict between Paul and Peter over table-fellowship is treated as though Paul's only complaint was Peter's vacillation—a view scarcely tenable if one gives credit to Gal. 2.

Among the controversial viewpoints argued and defended in greater detail is the North Galatian theory and the idea that Paul's Areopagus speech was no failure. In such cases the investigation instantly becomes alive and instructive, whether convincing or not. If only the book could have contained more material of this sort, its value would have been greater. As it is, the admiration which no reader could deny to the learning and piety of the author, the devoted skill of the translator, and, it must be added, the beautiful work of the editor and publisher, is crossed with disappointment. The translator's introductory note warns the reader, it is true, that "the author is concerned rather to lay bare the significance of the events that he describes for the life of the Church, than to establish an elaborate system of references and data to reinforce them"; but the disappointment remains. One remedy would be to publish some of Schlatter's commentaries in translation, so that English readers might see how he "got there". But now that Dr Levertoff has gone, perhaps that is asking too much.

CAMBRIDGE. C. F. D. MOULE.

THE SCROLLS FROM THE DEAD SEA. By Edmund Wilson. W. H. Allen. 10s. 6d.

This is a readable book about an enthralling subject. But it needs to be taken with a pinch of salt. Mr Wilson, despite the fact that we are informed on the book jacket that he was "fortified with a study of Hebrew" before preparing to write this book, is not a competent scholar in the field of ancient Jewish documents. He is a journalist who has indeed a thrilling story to tell, the story of a discovery of a veritable library of Hebrew manuscripts all of which are probably older than any known Biblical manuscripts, and some of which date back perhaps to the 2nd century B.C.

But, unfortunately, Mr Wilson has not contented himself with the tale of the discovery of these documents and of what has happened since the young Bedouin goat-herd threw a stone into the cave which proved to be the depository of this wealth of ancient manuscripts. He has hankered after telling another story (for the telling of which he has inadequate qualifications), the story of what is the significance of this discovery for religion and culture, and what effect the discovery has had already and may have in the future upon Biblical scholarship. The intrusion of the second theme causes the telling of the first story to become rather muddled; it is difficult sometimes for the reader to be clear about what really did happen.

Mr Wilson, as a journalist, likes to scent out the possibility of a scandal: he is, therefore, easily persuaded that Biblical scholars who do not accept the point of view of such scholars as Mr Flusser, M. Dupont-Somner and Dr Brownlee about these manuscripts are motivated by unscholarly considerations. For myself, I am persuaded that the majority of reputable Biblical scholars, both Catholic and Protestant, are (though they may sometimes be extremely conservative) so deeply involved in their studies that they would not willingly allow doctrinal prejudices to interfere with their proper judgments. That a scholar may refuse to be hasty in coming to any conclusion about the dating of manuscripts is quite understandable; but to an unscholarly mind such caution may well be extremely frustrating.

But what, in effect, is this "scandal" which Mr Wilson scents out? It is, I suppose, the assumption that these documents may explode the "Christian Myth". A great deal is made of two facts: that one of the documents, "The War of the Children of Light", foreshadows some of the teaching of Jesus; and that the Teacher of Righteousness referred to in some of the manuscripts is a Christ, to whom the words of Deutero-Isaiah about the Suffering Servant are applied. But what is there, in fact, explosive about either of these two facts—except possibly to Fundamentalists and to those orthodox Christians who have been falsely led to suppose that Christianity stands or falls on whether everything that Jesus did and said was unique? For many generations the vast majority of Biblical scholars, as well as multitudes of the rank and file of Christians, have recognized that the whole of Christ's life and teaching lies back upon the religion of Israel and its literature.

Biblical scholars have always interested themselves in what may be called the "Dark Ages" of the Jewish religion, the two hundred years before Christ. Most of us have been disappointed at the paucity of material covering this period; and whenever we have been confronted with the tiniest piece of fresh information, whatever may be its significance, we have always been delighted because it has helped to fill in the nearly empty canvas. That a whole range of new material for this particular period of Jewish history may be coming to hand will be, I have little doubt, a matter for great rejoicing amongst practically all Biblical scholars.

That there were claimants to the title "Christ" before Jesus is commonly recognized; and that a great deal of the teaching of Jesus is by no means unique is not unknown to anyone who understands anything at all about New Testament theology. What Christians claim about Jesus is not that he taught something new, or that he was the only person to reveal the mind and will of God, but that he himself uniquely lived out a life which is in accord not only with his own teachings but with what many, both in the past and in the present, have thought to be God's will.

The author of this book reveals a certain naivety on occasions. Thus he says: "I have seemed to note also, on the Christian side a certain reluctance to recognize that the characteristic doctrines of Christianity must have been developed gradually and naturally in

the course of a couple of hundred years out of a dissident branch of Judaism. This was what was upsetting to the scholars, who were mostly, on the Christian side, either Anglican divines, Roman Catholic priests, or Presbyterian or Methodist ministers, and, on the Jewish side, if not Orthodox Jews, at least specialists in the literature of Judaism, who approached it with a certain piety. . . ." Mr Wilson seems to have forgotten that, just as Christians and Jews may be pious about their literature, so too there is sometimes a passionate intensity of the person not committed to any religion to justify his own position!

Again, in writing of the sect responsible, it is thought, for these documents, he says: "What is the evolution that leads from the morality of the sect—which imposes fraternal forbearance among the members of the order . . . yet condemns and declares war on an enemy who is trying to crush it—to the later morality of Jesus which is marked by occasional flashes of pugnacity ('I have come not to bring peace, but a sword') yet is dominated by the principle of forgiveness?" How comes Mr Wilson to be so naive as to suppose that the Gospel saying "I have come not to bring peace, but a sword" was a "flash of pugnacity" in Jesus? Why does he not see that Jesus here is giving no injunction for the taking up of arms but is only stating the sad fact that the result of his preaching and living the Gospel of love will be persecution, bitterness and strife?

Here is another quotation: "New Testament scholars, it seems, have almost without exception boycotted the whole subject of the scrolls." As one who is closely in touch with many New Testament scholars, I must testify to the fact that I have found no reluctance on their part about this discovery, but only a real excitement; but they are concerned, it is true, to wait until those scholars most competent to judge have formulated some fairly generally agreed findings about the date and provenance of the manuscripts before they jump to conclusions. The caution of the scholars is to be preferred to the haste of Mr Wilson.

St Paul's. L. John Collins.

Ethics. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Translated by Neville Horton Smith. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

This is the last of Bonhoeffer's works to be translated into English, and it is good that we now have it, for he regarded it as his major work. It is the first volume in the "Library of Philosophy and Theology" launched by the S.C.M. Press (three more appeared during the autumn). Unfortunately Bonhoeffer was not able to complete his *Ethik*. What we have here are the parts it was possible to hide before he was arrested by the Gestapo on 5 April 1943. Some parts were already in the hands of the police before his arrest. He continued to develop his thoughts in the two years in prison before he was put to death, and this volume ends with two sections written in prison (and with three other miscellaneous papers, one a short

technical discussion of the doctrine of the *primus usus legis* in the Lutheran symbolic writings). Some of his most exciting prison thoughts on a "religionless Christianity", and on the coming of age of the secular world, which were only briefly indicated in his *Letters and Papers from Prison,* so that it is not possible to say whether he had arrived at an original and valuable insight or was stating more familiar thoughts in a new and paradoxical manner, represent a later stage of his thought than the *Ethik,* so that no further light is thrown upon them here. Furthermore, several of the present chapters are unfinished, some were partly re-written, and some are only preliminary sketches. Even the intended order of the material is not clear. Any evaluation therefore must realize that we have in this book only a rough draft of his intended book.

Bonhoeffer's main convictions about Christian ethics in the modern world are likely to be shared by most Christians in this country who have entered with any sympathy into the thinking on this matter within the Ecumenical Movement in the last thirty years. His methods of arriving at them, however, are not very digestible for British readers, except those well read in recent Continental Protestant theology. The sentence from p. 57, which the publishers quote in their "blurb", is typical of a good deal of the book: "The place which in all other ethics is occupied by the antithesis of 'should be' and 'is', idea and accomplishment, motive and performance, is occupied in Christian ethics by the relation of reality and realization, past and present, history and event (faith) or . . . the relation of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit." The English language does not readily lend itself to this treatment, and clearly the translator has had difficulties. Much of what is abstract and indigestible in the book appears to spring from the style of a good deal of German Lutheran theology, within which Bonhoeffer writes in order to combat what it usually says. He is particularly anxious to avoid the kind of separation between the Church and the world to which both the Lutheran doctrine of the "two realms" and Lutheran "pietist" thought has often led in practice. Like Karl Barth he elaborates a thoroughly Christocentric ethic which, because of the Person and Work of Christ, takes seriously the real man in the real world, "warts and all", as reconciled to God through Christ. He wants Christians to have a better appreciation of the secular, to act in the world with the confidence of men reconciled to God, free from over-scrupulosity about motives, and free from a wooden attitude which wants to "apply Christian principles" or rules. Instead of a doctrine of the Orders, he substitutes one of the four Mandates—Church, marriage, labour and government. The Christological foundations of these do not become very clear, and there is a further uncertainty in that the third Mandate is sometimes said to be culture, not labour. (This inconsistency is recognized but not resolved in a footnote on p. 253.)

It is disappointing that in the whole book the only specific problems that are given any extended discussion are the doctrine of the State (and this in a generalized way), and questions of reproduction,

sterilization, euthanasia and suicide, which are the subject of some pungent pages in the course of a section on the Christian view of the body. These are an indication of what Bonhoeffer could do and make one wish for more. He is a courageous thinker, not afraid to agree with Roman Catholic theologians (against most others) in disliking the killing of the foetus in cases where a mother is in danger of losing her life, and not afraid (against most Protestant theologians) to bring in the concept of the "natural". On this he has some subtle pages and (as in dealing with conscience), while apparently not doing so, in fact comes to much the same position as that held by many "catholic" and "liberal" theologians. It is odd that in such an intentionally Christocentric ethic his arguments against suicide are of a general theistic nature and that he misses what to many Christians is the only solid argument, that one must not throw away one's cross. Also one would like some specific discussion of the basis on which he uses Biblical texts.

Some of the writing is almost devotional in style; some is aphoristic; some, without explicitly mentioning it, is obviously a penetrating reaction to Hitlerism. Most British readers are likely to think that the truths of the book can be arrived at in a less cumbersome way, but it remains the noble legacy of a great Christian.

University of Manchester. Ronald Preston.

Essays Philosophical and Theological. By R. Bultmann Translated by James C. C. Greig. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

This translation of Bultmann's essays is one of the first volumes in the Library of Philosophy and Theology now being published by the S.C.M. Press. If it is a fair sample of what is to follow the series will be a valuable one.

These essays are taken from the second volume of *Glauben und Verstehen*. They are arranged chronologically, the earliest on "The Crisis in Belief" dating from 1931 while the two last on "Forms of Human Community" and "The Significance of the Idea of Freedom for Western Civilization" have not been previously published. The translation is clear, effective and smooth-running, and the book is excellently produced.

The first great merit of these essays to strike the reader is that Bultmann always defines his terms at the beginning of each essay and wastes no words on introducing the subject. The width and depth of his reading is soon in evidence. It is fascinating in these days to have a whole essay by a theologian devoted to Polis and Hades in the Antigone, while we notice at the same time that modern literature of various countries by no means escapes his sympathetic attention. However, the reader in search of further enlightenment on the demythologizing controversy must turn to other works of Bultmann. The problem is not mentioned by name, except in one passage on page 283 and in a footnote. At the same time, the most difficult of these essays, that on "The Problem of Hermeneutics", is concerned from one angle with this subject. The threads of the dis-

cussion on interpretation are well drawn together in Section VI. In concluding, Karl Barth is criticized for "a complete misunderstanding of what existential interpretation and the meaning attached to 'existence' in it, is".

The essays on "Natural Revelation" and "Humanism and Christianity" show an original and forceful mind at work. It is well said that "the *omnipotence* which man rightly ascribes to God *does not* confront man in the world at all in such a way that he can recognize it and submit himself to it. Nothing within the world is omnipotent and to the person who seeks an omnipotent master within the world the situation turns out as it did for St Christopher, he must wander from one to the other till he finds Christ. Nothing in the world is omnipotent, not even the world as a whole". This is reminiscent of a saying of Berdyaev's that God is in the world *incognito*. It is a pity Bultmann did not develop this point further, seeing that omnipotence is a crux of contemporary apologetics. There is, however, a significant glance at the problem from another angle in the essay "Christianity as East and West Religion" where he says, "Christianity . . . never gave up the Old Testament view of the world as the creation of the highest God; but it did consider that in the present of the 'moment' the world is given over to Satan and his demonic hosts. And so for Christianity, too, the world has become a strange land". Here we miss an Eastern Orthodox emphasis on the future transfiguration of the world, and the call to human creativity.

In "Forms of Human Community" the author does not fail to observe the religious significance of atheism, as when he speaks of "nihilists, atheists, mystics and philosophers as linked together in a pilgrimage in the search for God". "But belief," he goes on, "knows of a community of the called as well—the community of the *ecclesia*, the Church, in which are linked together those who hear the Word with a believing ear and pass it on as they confess it." From a Lutheran we expect a witness to "the essence of the Church as invisible", but non-Lutherans can agree with his criticisms of institutionalism. Yet the lack of an adequate doctrine of the Church is apparent throughout these essays.

This deficiency not unnaturally appears in the last essay (as we have said, hitherto unpublished) "Freedom and Western Civilization". Many things are well observed here. That "the greatest possible limitation of personal freedom goes along with the greatest possible security" has been said before, but is worth saying again. But the essay cannot but stir the reflection that two-thirds of humanity are outside "Western Civilization", and that these lack even freedom to eat adequately (*vide* Lord Boyd Orr *passim*). It is not therefore good enough to go on shouting from the housetops (of the Welfare State) "man shall not live by bread alone", while pointing to the well-known disadvantage of bureaucracy and the perils of the omnicompetent state.

"The future can only flourish on the venture of individuals" is the concluding sentence of this book. That is only half the truth. There is the judgment on the *nations*, "inasmuch as ye have done it

(or done it not) unto one of the least of these my brethren". What the Word of God is saying to "the fat and the strong" of the West at this "moment" cannot be answered simply by the ventures of individuals, however necessary they be. The manifest defects of our institutions, both secular and ecclesiastical, and the activity of Satan in the kingdoms of this world cannot absolve us from participation and involvement in the politics both of the world and the visible Church, especially in a democratic age when the responsibilities of citizenship are thrust upon the individual. For Bultmann's challenge we must be grateful, but we need a yet broader one.

St James' Hospital, Balham. O. Fielding Clarke.

The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism. Obtainable from The Church of Scotland Offices, 121 George Street, Edinburgh 2. 2s.

This is an interim report of a special commission of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland. As a basis for further work the Commission has undertaken a thorough review of the New Testament material, and the report is in effect a study of the New Testament doctrine of baptism.

It begins by considering the institution of the sacrament, and emphasizes the central importance of Pentecost and our Lord's own baptism by John for the early Church's understanding of it. A short section deals with the Baptist, and this leads on to a consideration of the typology involved in the baptism of Jesus where he is seen as leading a New Israel to a New Exodus. All this lies behind the call to repentance and baptism in the early Church.

The third section of the report is concerned with baptism in the Apostolic Church, and deals more fully with the themes already stated. The writers of the report are firmly in favour of the view that Jewish proselyte baptism had a moral content and was more than a mere ritual washing, though it is a pity that no indication is given that this is a debatable point.

The most striking section of the report is the one that deals with infant baptism. So often discussions of this question consist of well-worn apologetic clichés. Not so here. There is, rather, a real attempt to consider infant baptism in relation to the New Testament theology of baptism as a whole. It is pointed out that for both children and adults the sacrament is grounded in divine election, and that the main New Testament emphasis is that baptism, though it requires our response, "is not the Sacrament of our repentance, nor of our faith, but of God's adoption and His promise of the Spirit" (p. 21). The conclusion of this discussion is that the New Testament not only allows infant baptism, but has a theology that *requires* it (p. 29). The case is cogently argued and demands careful attention from those who hold to believers' baptism only, but one wonders whether this conclusion is not too emphatic. If it is, it would seem to result from the authors' not noting the possible objections that can be brought against their arguments. For instance, it is assumed (p. 23)

without question that the "little ones" in Matt. 18. 6 are infants, and there is no suggestion that the word has been taken by some to mean adult converts new to the Faith. Again, one might ask for evidence for the statement (p. 24) that after a Jewish infant had been circumcised it was blessed by the laying on of hands while the Aaronic blessing was said.

The fifth and longest section of the report is a summary of the main features of the practice and theology of baptism in apostolic times. There is a good study of the meaning of our incorporation into Christ in baptism as it is set out by St Paul, and another excellent passage stresses the importance of the relationship between the eucharist and baptism.

The report as a whole emphasizes the *objectivity* of baptism, that it is God's hold of us. The authors, however, do not ignore the fact of human response without which baptism would be "unthinkable" for the New Testament writers. But there is need here for development, for the problem of our response in faith to God's Faithfulness is acute where infants are being baptized. It is to be hoped that the final report will consider this question more fully.

The present document, however, is a stimulating exposition of the New Testament teaching about baptism, and one that Anglicans would do well to read.

KELHAM. SIMON MEIN, S.S.M.

CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS. By Heinrich Quistorp. Translated by Harold Knight. Lutterworth Press. 20s.

THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE. By Robert Preus. Oliver and Boyd. 20s.

"In the treatment of eschatological doctrines proper Calvin expressed himself somewhat sketchily," says Quistorp (p. 55). And yet he can write a book on Calvin's eschatology. The reason is that Calvin is a theologian whose whole outlook, whole approach, is eschatological. This is at once a strength and a weakness in his theology. A strength, inasmuch as the eschatology is so integral a part of the theology as to be inseparable from it without entirely changing its character. Indeed, Martin Schulze was so dazzled by the sight of this undeniable truth that in his book *Meditatio futurae vitae* he elevated eschatology into the governing principle of Calvin's "system". A weakness, because, without a thoroughly worked-out doctrine of eschatology, the New Testament balance is lost. In the New Testament, not only is eschatology the fibre of all teaching, but it also receives due attention as a distinct doctrine.

While we must regret Calvin's half-hearted treatment of the doctrine, we cannot but admire his consistently eschatological outlook. Rarely does he forget the *eschaton*. And this, as Quistorp reminds us, is because "Calvin's theology is Christology; this is equally true of his eschatology" (p. 22). By keeping his eyes fixed, as he did, on the One who is the Last as well as the First, how could he fail to think eschatologically? For Calvin, the two are correlative. He has

himself told us that "the only way of retaining as well as of restoring pure doctrine is to place Christ before our sight such as he is with all his blessings" (Comm. on Col. 1. 12). And therefore it follows that his theology will be viewed eschatologically. The basis of his eschatology is Christology.

Mention was made above of Martin Schulze. His book, vitiated though it was by extra-Biblical presuppositions, contained elements of greatness. In its grasp of the problem and in that it directed attention to the importance of eschatology in Calvin it was a valuable work. But it must be said that Schulze has now been superseded by Quistorp, whose thinking is far more governed and directed by the New Testament, as well as being a better guide to Calvin's teaching.

We should, finally, congratulate the translator, who has made the English version as clear and readable as the original.

Dr Preus' book on the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture among 17th-century Lutheran scholastics has much to commend it. Exhaustive and painstaking, it leads us into the intricacies of those subtle thinkers. But its chief attraction for English readers will be its novelty. We know many of the names that appear—Hunnius, Quenstedt, John Gerhard and so on—but the number of English theologians who have actually read their writings must be small; fewer still those who find in them kindred spirits.

The problem of the inspiration of the Bible as it was expressed in the 17th century no longer occupies us greatly. Or perhaps truer to say that we formulate it differently, preferring to think of the authority of the Bible. To read about these men is to be continually amazed that, with all the enormous labour they employed (no dilettantes these, but good professional theologians, honest workmen), with all their humility before the Scriptures and strivings to keep to its teaching, they should have missed the main thing. Not only do they look upon the Bible as a depository of doctrines but they never seem to have satisfactorily co-ordinated the Bible as revelation with the revelation of the Incarnate Word. There is, certainly, a passage (p. 20) in which Dr Preus raises the question of the relationship of the written to the Incarnate Word, only to answer it with the words: "The personal Word, along with the Father and the Holy Spirit, may be said to be the real author of the written Word." Yet at least echoes of something better sound in a quotation from Dannhauer: "The norm and standard for portraying [Christ] is the revealed Word. If one departs from this, he portrays not Christ, but his own dreams" (p. 1). That it remains only an echo becomes plain from the section on "Inspiration and Christology", where we are told that they refused to apply the Incarnation as an analogy to the union of divine and human in the Scriptures. Did this refusal *really* spring from a reverence for the mystery of the Incarnation?

But we must say that to criticize their doctrine does not mean that we are not impressed by this book about them. We are; and we are grateful to Dr Preus for helping us to know better these theologians who stand outside our English theological tradition.

Little Ponton with Stroxton. T. H. L. Parker.

SHORTER NOTICES

ON AUTHORITY AND REVELATION. By Søren Kierkegaard. Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton University Press (London: Cumberlege). 36s.

This book has in English the sub-title "The Book on Adler, or a Cycle of Ethico-Religious Essays". It was not published in Kierkegaard's lifetime, but was preserved and published in one of the volumes of the *Papirer*. The material is undoubtedly interesting. The occasion of it was the trial and deposition of a Lutheran pastor called Adler for claiming to have the authority of special revelations. This leads Kierkegaard into a long, rambling, witty and serious study of the nature of authority, with special reference to the difference between an apostle and a genius. (This part *was* published by Kierkegaard and has also appeared already in English in the work entitled *The Present Age*). Many of the ideas familiar in other works, the attack on Hegel, the difference between an aesthetic attitude and one of faith in the paradox, the meaning of the 1,800 years of acceptance of Christianity, and the like, are to be found here. Kierkegaard's fundamental conservatism and objectivity in regard to the main elements of Christian doctrine are to be seen here, if only by implication in his laborious attack upon Mr Adler. If I had any say in the indefatigable labours of Dr Lowrie I should say, please now give us more of the unknown, original, most important parts of the *Papirer*, especially the diaries, of which we have so little in English.

LONDON. R. GREGOR SMITH.

ENGLISH LAW AND THE MORAL LAW. By A. L. Goodhart. Stevens. 12s. 6d.

This volume consists of the fourth series of Hamlyn Lectures, delivered by the Master of University College, Oxford, in 1952. It is a learned and allusive examination of examples from the realms of Constitutional, Administrative and International Law, and from Criminal Law, Tort and Contract, in the course of which Dr Goodhart disposes of the Austinian "command theory" of law and with it rejects Professor Kelsen's statement that law is a coercive order based on sanctions. The core of his argument lies in the conclusion that "an obligatory order . . . may be regarded as obligatory without coercion". On this distinction Dr Goodhart establishes his "Obligation Theory of Law" which assumes a moral order, and the aphoristic conclusions of the opening lecture are of the first importance: "Law is a rule of conduct which is recognized as being obligatory. . . . In English law . . . morality has played a particularly important part . . . English law and the moral law are rarely in conflict."

But the word "rarely" reveals the unease in the whole book; the accumulation of instances forces the writer to the conclusion that though morality has been a shaping force in English law, in many cases morality has been denied; indeed, on any arithmetic basis, the adducing of examples in the course of the book makes the penulti-

mate sentence sound something of a rhetorical overstatement: "The sense of obligation [to obey the law] is based . . . on reason, morality, religion, and the inherited traditions of the nation."

In fact, "religion" is not assumed by Dr Goodhart to be a necessary basis of moral obligation. The conjunction of terms, "reason, morality, religion", would appear to assume the pattern of natural law theology as a background to our system of common law (as we found it argued in Sir Henry Slesser's distinguished *Judicial Office* in 1943). On the contrary, Dr Goodhart tacitly rejects this whole position by his aside on the "so-called revival of 'natural law' thinking at the present time".

It would seem churlish to cavil at an argument which so firmly rejects "command" and "sanction" as the sole bases of law, but the reader is inevitably driven, when "morality" has been substituted for these inadequate theories, to ask the prior question concerning the source of the moral obligation which is invoked throughout the work. Unhappily, the important point at which the question is raised in the opening lecture is the thinnest and most tentative passage in the book.

W. M. Merchant.
University College,
Cardiff.

The Christian Imperative. By Max Warren. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

Royal Priesthood. By T. F. Torrance. 9s. The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry. By J. K. S. Reid. 5s. Nos. 3 and 4 of the Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, Oliver and Boyd.

The Epistle to the Romans. By A. M. Hunter. The Epistle to the Hebrews. By William Neil. Torch Bible Commentaries. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d. each.

The Christian Imperative, from the evangelistic point of view, is "Go, preach—Go, teach—Go, heal—Go, baptize". Max Warren expounds these themes wisely and deeply, and makes us see the immense complexity of their application to Asia and Africa and the mission-field at home. No further recommendation is needed. This is a book to buy and to ponder over.

Royal Priesthood is a closely written document; its 108 pages contain the matter of a fair-sized book. It is all biblical theology, and it is a rebuke to our Anglican habit of dealing with the ministry primarily in terms of the validity of orders. First we are given a view of the spiritual quality and meaning of the O.T. sacrifices; then we come to the Priesthood of Christ, resting on his Sonship, and to the worship of the Church, not as a *mimēsis* or *paradeigma*, an earthly counterpart of his heavenly Sacrifice, but as a *hupodeigma*, a participation in it. For the Church, as the body of Christ, has its life "in Christ", that in it there may be "an unfolding of the incarnational revelation of God in Christ"; there is an ontological relation of the Church to Christ, for *agapē* describes its very nature. But we may not think of the Church as if it were already *ecclesia triumphans*;

for we must take seriously the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord, and not leave out of account his Last Advent. Within the Church there is a ministerial priesthood, which must be seen in relation to the universal priesthood of all Christians, and whose greatest function is the celebration of the Eucharist. Therefore the true "essential ministry" of the Church is the presbyterate, and the episcopate is not in reality a separate order; here St Jerome and St Thomas and Calvin stand on one side, and Duns Scotus and we Anglicans on the other; Presbyterians and Anglicans hold different views of what the "presbyter" or "priest" is. The former think of a "corporate episcopate" vested in the presbyterate, yet rather in the presbytery (corresponding roughly to our diocese) than in the individual presbyter. Dr Torrance asks whether our individual episcopate does not derogate from the centrality of the true sacrament of unity, which is Christ in the Eucharist which the presbyter administers. Needless to say, this brief summary does no manner of justice to this treatise, in which many things are said very well indeed. A worthy review would need to be of ample length, and would need to deal with the relation of the episcopate to the apostolate.

The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry is possibly the best criticism which has yet appeared of the relevant parts of *The Apostolic Ministry*. Is the apostolate an office or simply a function? Chapter I deals with the gospels and appears to demonstrate that it is there regarded as an office. In Chapter II Dr Reid considers what it is that the Apostles in the apostolic age actually do, and he shows that we cannot solve our questions about the ministry from the use of the word *episcopos* in N.T. Chapter III brings us to the central problem of the relation of the later bishop to the N.T. Apostle; there is a fair agreement about the evidence, but deep disagreement about the interpretation of it. Is there an apostolic office carried on into the episcopate, or was our Lord's commission given to the Church as a whole and not specially to the Apostles? Dr Reid thinks in the last resort of the apostolic office as unique, and that the original Apostles could not in the nature of things have successors. But it seems strange that he nowhere mentions the place of the Apostles as Stewards in the Household (as in Luke 12. 42), as Shepherds of the Flock (as John 21. 15–17), as Builders of the Temple (as 1 Cor. 3. 9–17). The function of "witnesses to the resurrection" could not be transmitted; these latter functions could be and must be handed on to successors.

The commentaries on *Romans* and *Hebrews* fill their places very nicely and adequately in the "Torch" series. Comments in detail could be made; I have space only for one. It seems strange that Neil, and William Manson whose excellent book of "Hebrews" he largely follows, should deny that there is any reference or allusion in the Epistle to the eucharistic sacrament, in view of the evidence that in N.T. times they met on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread.

Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M.

St Michael's House,
Crafers, South Australia.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Edward Langton, *History of the Moravian Church* (12s. 6d.).

ALMQVIST AND WIKSELLS (UPPSALA): Bror Olsson, *Mundus Senescens* [in Swedish with an English summary] (n.p.).

BLACKFRIARS: *Christian Asceticism and Modern Man* (16s.).

BLACKWELL: A. J. Festugière, O.P., *Epicurus and his Gods* (9s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. B. Braithwaite, *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Christian Belief* (3s. 6d.); Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (27s. 6d.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (U.S.A.): W. H. Stowe, *More Lay Readers than Clergy!* (50 cents).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Jean-Nicholas Grou, *How to Pray* (7s. 6d.).

COLLINS: F. W. Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism* (21s.); Nels F. S. Ferré, *Making Religion Real* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Self and the Dramas of History* (21s.).

FAITH PRESS: H. P. Greaves, *The Marks of the Blessed* (4s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: George Reindorp, *What about You?* (4s. 6d.); Umphrey Lee, *The Lord's Horseman* (12s. 6d.); A. R. Wallace, *Christian Focus* (10s. 6d.); J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: J. W. C. Wand, *Seven Steps to Heaven* (3s.); Romano Guardini, *The Lord* (28s.); Albert Van Eyken, *The Status of Man in the Universe* (7s. 6d.); L. E. Elliott-Binns, *English Thought 1860–1900* (28s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: G. W. Bromily, *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian* (12s. 6d.); G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Preaching the Gospel from the Gospels* (8s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: W. A. Jurgens (Ed.), *St John Chrysostom on the Priesthood* (17s. 6d.); W. Kegley and W. Bretal (Editors), *Reinhold Niebuhr: his Religious, Social, and Political Thought* (45s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: *The School of Self-Knowledge* (3s.); A Religious of C.S.M.V., *Also the Holy Ghost* (4s.); *Prayer in Lent* [a practical book of advice on the use of Lent by the author of *The Way*] (5s.); A Religious of C.S.M.V. (Ed.), *The Golden Chain* (5s.); Kenneth Mackenzie, *The Divine Prayer* (3s. 6d.); H. C. Robins, *A Three Hours' Meditation* (2s.); St Aelred of Rievaulx, *On Jesus at Twelve Years Old* (3s. 6d.); Sibyl Harton, *In Search of Quiet* (3s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: Joyce Cosgrave, *The Story in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* [illustrated, for children] (1s. 9d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Joost de Blank, *Call of Duty* (5s.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Colin Beale, *Television and Religion* (1s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Olive Wyon, *Consider Him* (3s. 6d.); R. Gregor Smith, *The New Man* (10s. 6d.); Charles E. Raven, *Christ and the Modern Opportunity* (8s. 6d.); Amos N. Wilder, *Otherworldliness and the New Testament* (7s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: John Bligh, S.J., *Ordination to the Priesthood* (16s.).

S.P.C.K.: Harold Riley (Ed.), *A Book of Daily Prayer* (4s. 6d.); E. C. Whitaker, *The Intercessions of the Prayer Book* (6s. 6d.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Hans Bietenhard, *Das Tausend Jahrige Reich* (14.50 Swiss francs); Paul Jacobs, *Wille und Wandlung* (10 Swiss francs); Heinrich Berger, *Calvins Geschichtsauffassung* (14 Swiss francs); Kurt Lüthi, *Judas Iskarioth in der Geschichte der Auslegung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (12 Swiss francs); Hendrik van Oyen, *Theologische Erkenntnislehre* (13.95 Swiss francs).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THE PARISH PRIEST AT WORK

C. R. Forder **12s. 6d. net.**

"Buy your Vicar a copy."—*The Provost of Bradford*

WINGS OF AN EAGLE

G. Lacey May **10s. 6d. net.**

"This anthology of sixty Caroline sermons is of spiritual, literary and historical value and interest. Good sermons need no commentary but they often need extracting from cumbrous and ancient editions. This service is here admirably done." *Church of England Newspaper*

S · P · C · K

FONDATION HARDT
ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Volume I

LA NOTION DU DIVIN

DEPUID MOMÈRE JUSQU'À PLATON

SEVEN PAPERS AND DISCUSSIONS

by

H. J. ROSE, PIERRE CHANTRAINE, BRUNO SNELL, OLOF GIGON
H. D. F. KITTO, FERNAND CHAPOUTHIER, W. J. VERDENIUS

8vo viii+310 pages, cloth

£2 net

The first volume of a new series published by the 'Fondation Hardt pour l'Etude de l'antiquité classique', created a few years ago at Vandoeuvres-Geneva. Each of the seven 'Exposés' is followed by a discussion, all contributions being kept in the original English, French, or German

A detailed prospectus is available
Of all booksellers

Agents for the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD. 3-4 Petty Cury, Cambridge

BEAUFOYS

SANCTUARY

COMMUNION WINE

Beaufoys *Sanctuary* Wine is of the highest standard, produced and bottled in Great Britain with the fermented juice of the finest quality grapes. As sole suppliers to the S.P.C.K. Beaufoys are proud to offer you this wine which has been prepared especially for Church purposes.

7/6d Per Bottle

(Postage: 2/- on 1 Bottle, 2/3d on 2 Bottles, 2/6d on 3 Bottles)

Packing and Carriage Free on all orders exceeding three bottles

Quantities of one dozen or over may be obtained through the S.P.C.K. delivered free and subject to special quantity reductions of 1/- per dozen; 1/6d per dozen on 2 dozen; and 2/- per dozen on 3 dozen or more.

THEOLOGY: *1s. in 1939; 1s. in 1956*

1s. in 1939 equals 4¾d. in 1956

But Theology is still as good as ever.

There must be very few periodicals still appearing at their pre-War prices. *THEOLOGY* is one. The price of *THEOLOGY* is 1s. a copy and, despite the rising cost of printing, it has been decided for the present to retain that price. It is hoped that by maintaining a theological periodical at so small a price a real service to the Church is done.

On the other hand, it is impossible to ignore the rising costs weighing upon every publisher. It has therefore been decided that in future the price of *THEOLOGY* will be *exclusive* of postage.

The new rates will be:

1s. per copy plus 2½d. postage

12s. per year plus 2s. 6d. postage

These rates will come into immediate force for new postal subscribers; they will apply to present subscribers as they renew their subscriptions.

They will not apply to the newly ordained who have taken advantage of the special terms offered to them in a scheme begun by S.P.C.K. at the beginning of the year to assist the newly ordained to maintain touch with theological thought.

CHURCH UNION SUMMER SCHOOL OF SOCIOLOGY

Jesus College, Oxford *July 30th—August 3rd, 1956*

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF SANCTIFICATION

Christian Sanctification faced with "the World"
The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D. (Canon of Windsor)

The Validity and Limits of a Scientific Sociology
Philip Mairet, Esq. (Formerly Editor of 'The Frontier')

Holiness in the Context of Contemporary Society
The Rev. C. H. G. Hopkins (Vicar of St Luke's, Pallion, Sunderland)

The discussions will be reviewed and summarised by The Rev. Eric Mascall, D.D. (Student of Christ Church, Oxford)

Fee £5 10 0 *Further particulars from Miss H. Highley, 134, Earls Court Road, London, W.8.*

MAN IN THE MIDST

JOHN TAYLOR

"Today the Church suffers from having a pulpit-perspective of the world, which sets us, as Christians, apart from other men yet keeps us ever anxious about their response. We shall never again effectively proclaim the Gospel until we see mankind from the inside. . . ." These words from the last chapter provide the key to this exciting and challenging book. In helping us to "see mankind from the inside" the author shows how man stands in a unique relationship to God and to the rest of creation, and he examines what this means in practical terms in daily life. We see the intolerable tensions that result from the two relationships, and that these tensions can be fully resolved only in Christ, Who, though God, came to be the "Man in the Midst".

84 pages $8\frac{1}{2}''$ x $5\frac{1}{2}''$ Bound in Linson 6s.

HIGHWAY PRESS

6 SALISBURY SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.4